The Journal of
Pastoral Care

VOL. VIII FALL, 1954 No. 3

THE BABYLONIC CAPTIVITY OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY

THE REV. JOACHIM SCHARFENBERG, Th.D.
Pastor of Evangelical Lutheran Church, Ehrfurt, Germany

Pastoral theology is a theological discipline. This means it is primarily concerned with the explication of the gospel as it is given through the revelation in Jesus Christ. At the same time pastoral theology is also concerned with man. It recognizes its obligation by the commission of its Lord to seek man in his desolation, to go out to him and find him where he actually is in order to bring him the Christian message in a way that he can really understand and enable him to make it a vivid experience in his everyday life. Consequently any pastoral theology demands a thorough knowledge of man. It is precisely here that pastoral theology must come to terms with a certain quandary. For it seems that there is no completely clear conception of man as such within the biblical framework of revelation. The Bible shows a marked lack of interest in man as such. Its interest is in man in his relationship with God or in his general position as a being ruled by sin or by grace. Apart from this relation, as far as the Bible is concerned, man seems not to exist. In the few passages where man is spoken of, apart from this relationship, the terminology of the secular world is introduced with some naivete.

This practice of ingenuously taking over the categories of secular philosophy and psychology, so far as man is concerned, has colored the Christian doctrine of man for centuries without leading to serious conflict within theological thought. Plato's anthropological conception in the form of dividing man into an immortal, worthy soul and a mortal, less-worthy body

has influenced broad areas of Christian thought down to our day. This distinction between nature and super-nature in man based on Aristotle's philosophy found its classical expression in the Thomistic system and is still at home in Roman Catholic scholastic theology. Secular theories of man have also entered into Protestant tradition. One needs only to remember the various means of uniting the soul with the body at the moment of creation as it has been adopted in the old Lutheran orthodoxy and explained by preexistentialism, creationism, and traducianism which still forms the basis for the doctrine of man in certain Lutheran groups. These secular influences, however, caused no special difficulty, but were effortlessly absorbed from scholastic theology of the time. Theology was so much concerned with the doctrine of God or Christ that the doctrine of man played only a subordinate role. Man was only of interest as the recipient of salvation and, as such—in Lutheran orthodoxy for instance, the classical system which is considered to be most strongly "psychological"—he has been sufficiently discussed within the framework of the doctrine of the ordo salutis. Even here, however, the different "status homini" (*vocatio, illuminatio, conversio, regeneratio, justificatio, unio mystica* and *sanctificatio*) have always been described as first and foremost the work of the Holy Spirit.

A fundamental change occurs with the beginning of modern thinking. With the Renaissance discovery of man, man himself comes to be an object of interest and research. As the Renaissance conception of man gains importance and significance, however, it comes into conflict with the theological tradition. On the basis of the new-won knowledge of man the theological tradition is to be criticized. There comes about a reduction of the Christian message to accord with the new picture of man and an elimination of all those doctrines which have no immediate existential significance for man. This can be observed especially in the following examples:

For Kant and Fichte man is essentially "moral being." [1] His destiny and final goal can be interpreted only in moral terms. The theological task which these thinkers set themselves was to criticize Christian doctrine from this point of reference. The dogmas of Christian teaching must be either morally interpreted or can be eliminated as worthless. Here we see one of the most important problems of pastoral theology clearly expressed; the great question of how modern man can participate in the divine drama of salvation. Kant and Fichte answer this question, which evidently is still not settled today, clearly and unequivocally: only by moral life. In the beginning was the Imperative. Only in moral conduct do the Christian dogmas find their significance. Only in moral conduct can they be grasped and comprehended by man who is essential moral being.

Schleiermacher's thought, in general, points in the same direction; how-

---

[1] Immanuel Kant: *Religion within the Boundary of Pure Reason;* Edinburgh, Clark, 1838. Johann Gottlieb Fichte: *The Vocation of Man* (popular works, 4th ed.), Vol. I, London, 1889.

ever it is modified by his different assumptions.[2] As a result of his preoccupation with the romantic categories he sees man essentially characterized by "feeling." He turns decisively against all previous attempts to interpret religion intellectually or morally. For him the special "domain" of religion is feeling. By means of feeling man attains "sensitivity and taste for the infinite" and experiences participation in God. By his "feeling of sheer dependence" man has to experience the Christian doctrine. Christian dogmas are valuable only insofar as they can be experienced by man. Here we see again the attempt to give man an existential share in Christian truth, now primarily by means of feeling.

The logical consequence of such a point of view may be seen in the system of a thinker like Ludwig Feuerbach.[3] Here man himself has become the center of attention to such an extent that the existence of an objective theology is openly denied. Theology is nothing else but anthropology. Religion is an illusion of man which must be deduced from particular psychological phenomena of his thought mechanism. Man has usurped the place of God, and Nietzsche consequently carries this train of thought to its end when he frees man completely from all authority and makes him goal and end of himself.[4] Man has only to obey an unlimited law of self-realization, the so-called "will for power."

The development of these lines of thought and their consequences are of great importance because here lie the roots of the kind of thinking which confronts our contemporary pastoral theology with weighty problems. It is precisely the same naturalism which so strongly influenced the thought of Sigmund Freud and from which he derived his concept of man.[5] It is at least questionable whether Freud himself had the insight to see that his scientific findings, as important and epochal as they were, were not sufficient for the development of a generally valid and binding concept of man. But when Freud claims to be able to develop such a concept of man and to enter the field of philosophy, he does not draw the conclusions from pure scientific data as he obviously thinks, but simply falls back on the naturalism of Feuerbach and Nietzsche. The consequences must therefore be the same. On the basis of his concept of man, theology comes in for its heaviest criticism. Dogmas are interpreted as a false projection of the subliminal consciousness into reality and religion is "unmasked" simply as the great illusion.

Because of Freud's epochal discoveries which greatly enlarged the knowledge of man, especially of his subconscious and the mechanics of his drives,

---

[2] Friedrich Ernst Daniel Schleiermacher: *The Christian Faith;* Edinburgh, Clark, 1928. Also *On Religion; Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers;* London, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1893.

[3] Ludwig Feuerbach: *Essence of Christianity;* London, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1890.

[4] Friedrich Nietzsche: *The Will to Power: An Attempt at Transvaluation of All Values;* New York, Macmillan, 1914.

[5] Sigmund Freud: *The Future of an Illusion;* New York, Liveright, 1928. Also *Moses and Monotheism;* London, Hogarth, 1951.

pastoral theology after Freud has been confronted with the problem of reconciling his indications with the Christian concept of man. Above all, the Swiss theologian Oscar Pfister has devoted his life to this task. His method, however, is basically the same as that which could be observed from Kant to Feuerbach. In his chief work, *Christianity and Fear*,[6] he attempts to transplant one of Freud's major propositions that neurotic fear results from inhibitions of sexuality or inhibitions of love into the field of religion and finds substantially the same in 1 John 4:18 that in love there is no fear. This passage, according to Pfister, is the heart of Christianity and Christian dogma must be judged, accordingly, by whether it can serve the one aim of casting out fear. From a position gained by psychological insight Christian doctrine is criticized and tailored to fit this position. In a ten-point program at the end of his book Pfister makes suggestions for the elimination of those parts of the tradition which do not immediately contribute to the allaying of fear. To this principle all the following must be sacrificed: the concept of a just and wrathful God, all that goes beyond the "historical Jesus" (which is a theological fiction, incidentally!), the doctrine of original sin, soteriology, the central position of scriptures, all liturgical form, eschatology, and the traditional doctrine of the church.

The theological reaction which we meet today in Karl Barth and his followers must be understood against the background of this wide-spread psychologizing of religion.[7] To the antropocentric point of departure he vehemently opposes a new theocentric point of departure which is to be grounded in the Word of God. The question of whether the Christian doctrine of man must not at least be oriented to an anthropology developed and presented outside of theology is answered radically in the negative. This means the retreat to a strictly theological anthropology which can only be grounded christologically.

Karl Barth's views were extended to pastoral theology in two standard works which are still definitive in European pastoral care: Hans Asmussen, *Die Seelsorge* and Eduard Thurneysen, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*.[8] In Asmussen we find the definition that pastoral care is the extension of the word of God to the individual; the only difference between pastoral care and a sermon is that the sermon deals with the many people of the congregation while pastoral care is concerned with the individual. This definition is taken over by Thurneysen and enlarged only to the extent that pastoral care must take the form of a conversation. While Asmussen emphasizes the element of pure instruction in accord with the Lutheran tradition to which he feels obliged, Thurneysen stresses the concept of church discipline in pastoral care according to his Calvinistic background. Common to both is their striving for more "objective" pastoral care which will not give

---

[6] New York, Macmillan, 1948.

[7] Karl Barth: *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III, 2. Zollikon Zurich, 1948.

[8] Munchen, Kaiser, 1937 and 1950, respectively.

dominance to the concept of man and which will keep itself free of all psychologizing.

It is evident from the development which the problem of man has most recently taken within pastoral theology that this was not the final answer. A new point of view appears to be prepared from two different angles; a theological and a psychological one.

From the theological side the theology of Rudolph Bultmann and his program of demythologizing seems to meet the demand to grant man a higher place within theological thought.[9] His point of departure is wholly anthropocentric in that he begins with the question, what can modern man still understand of the biblical message which comes in largely mythological language and rests on the presuppositions of a different world view? Once again there is the question of how man can find subjective participation in an objective drama of redemption. This time the answer is seen in the "self-understanding" of man to whom the mythos must be made accessible, i.e., must be "existentially interpreted." A program of elimination has been replaced with one of interpretation. This interpretation, however, is uninterested in the historical factuality of the drama of redemption and gives validity only to its "existential significance." In other words, historic saving acts are converted into timeless principles.

On the psychological side, however, Freudian psychology is developed further in the individual-psychology of Alfred Adler and the depth-psychology of Carl Gustav Jung, which by no means share Freud's open hostility towards religion.[10] Jung's oft-quoted statement that psychotherapeutic healing is not complete unless religion somehow makes its appearance opens the door for the development in the course of which psychotherapists from Karen Horney to Fritz Kunkel reveal a growing interest in religion and support a fruitful alliance between psychotherapy and pastoral care in the hope of improved healing results.[11]

The attempt from the theological side to grant man a role in the drama of salvation through interpretation on the basis of his new self-understanding and the efforts on the side of psychotherapy to enter into fruitful cooperation with the representatives of religion have widely influenced the present discussion which strives for a valid and constructive solution of the above mentioned problems.

---

[9] Rudolph Bultmann: "Neues Testament und Mythologie," in *Keryma und Mythos,* ed. by H. W. Bartsch: Hamburg, Reich & Heindrich, 1948. Also *Theology of the New Testament;* New York, Scribner's, 1951.

[10] Carl Gustav Jung: *Modern Man in Search of Soul;* New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1934. Also *Psychology and Religion;* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950.

[11] Fritz Kunkel: *Character, Growth and Education;* Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1938. Also *In Search of Maturity; an Enquiry into Psychology, Religion, and Self-Education;* New York, Scribner's, 1943.

Reuel Howe's efforts in his book, *Man's Need and God's Action,* to present the gospel as the only possible and logically deducible answer to man's need follows these same lines.[12] He is concerned with man's understanding and response to God's action "in terms of our need" (p. 15). This interpretation tries to make the gospel more understandable to modern man; its center is the good news that God loves us. To the human state of sin, which is the state of separation, God gave his answer which meant that through Christ we have "some one who can be at one with us and through whom we can find at-oneness with all" (p. 9). This good news sets people free to use things and to love people in their proper order. "To whatever degree there is true regard and love for others, person-healing occurs" (p. 43). Because man is never able to love fully there is a tremendous need for Christ, who is the only one who can love fully and establish a new kind of relationship which becomes actual whenever people love as Christ loved. This is the meaning of reconciliation which is preached by the church, especially by the "language of relationships" (p. 65), which finds its basic expression is the sacraments. The human response to this is faith, which is basically trust. This trust cannot be taught, it has to be "awakened" (p. 71) in a person. So the business of the church is "to be the relationship through which man may experience the love of God that reconciles us to himself and to one another" (p. 95). This is based on God's acceptance of us, which is justification by faith. Howe's attempted interpretation is so constructed that those terms which are more or less associated with the historical drama of redemption in Christ, such as sin, gospel, reconciliation, sacraments, and justification by faith, are interpreted by the timeless principles: separation, love, at-one-ness, acceptance, and the new kind of relationship.

The attempt to achieve "alliance and collaboration" (p. 262) or even a "valid synthesis" (p. 7) between psychotherapy and Christianity is especially expressed in Albert C. Outler's latest publication, *Psychotherapy and the Christian Message.*[13] His proposals rest above all on the assumption that Christianity and psychotherapy "agree in practice but differ in theory" (p. 7). The solution, therefore, lies in accepting the "practical wisdom" of psychotherapy while "rejecting its humanistic and naturalist perspective" (p. 45). But this does not take place without sacrifices on both sides. Theology must also content itself that from the psychological standpoint certain theological opinions are to be rejected. In the anthropological field it is the concept of the soul that must be dropped to satisfy the psychologist. In the field of hamartology it is the concept of total depravity (p. 111), in soteriology Lutheran *"simul justus et peccator"* (p. 183) which causes objection because the human possibility is a project which "God and man share together" (p. 177). In ethics the Christian idea of self-denial must give

---

[12] Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1953.

[13] New York, Harper, 1954.

way to the psychologist's demand for self-affirmation. This is not the place to discuss how far these criticisms are justified, it is enough to point out that methodologically Outler stands on the same ground as supported the critical theology of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: from the standpoint of the secular concept of man it is believed necessary to criticize theology; and theology is measured here with a non-theological standard. We shall later raise the question whether this is in fact a theological possibility.

Paul Tillich's program in his book, *The Courage to Be,* is likewise a program of interpretation.[14] He attempts to "interpret faith through an analysis of courage" (p. 9). He believes in this way he can overcome the "nonexistential thinking of the Protestant theologians" and their belief "that the doctrinal concepts of the biblical message can be preached as objective truth, without any attempt to mediate the message to man in his psychosomatic and psychosocial existence" (p. 132). Thus he is also concerned with the existential participation of man that must take its place in pastoral theology. Tillich, nevertheless, shows that he is much more strongly interested in ontological questions than is the existentialism of Kierkegaard or Heidegger. He is concerned with an "ontological understanding of human nature" in the light of which "the body of material provided by psychology and sociology can be organized" (p. 65). But the path which Tillich takes to reach this seems to be of special significance. He appears to have acquiesced in the fact that in theology "in regard to the doctrine of man the escape from philosophy was plainly unsuccessful" (p. 72). It is, therefore, no wonder that Tillich himself very largely turns to non-Christian philosophy. He believes that the desired "existential point of view" is effective in Platonism, for example, albeit, "within the frame of an Essentialist anthropology" (p. 128). Consequently, the anthropological "locus" of existential participation shifts close to what Plato understands by thymos—that area of man's being which "lies between the intellectual and sensual element in man" (p. 3), it is the "middle of man's being (the thymoeides)" the loss of which is responsible for "Kant's moral rigor and Descartes' division of being into thought and extension" (*ibid.*). He is concerned with the "middle ground between bloodless intellect and meaningless vitality, the spiritual soul in which vitality and intentionality are united" and which "was presupposed in the Greek word arete" (p. 82 f.). If the so-described "personal center" becomes the center of attention the danger can be avoided that man either becomes "transformed into an abstract moral subject" or is "considered an epistemological subject" (p. 133). With this striving to reserve a special "province of the personality," i.e., the personal center, beyond intellectual and moral interpretations, Tillich again decisively adopts the tendencies of Schleiermacher. This becomes particularly clear when Tillich sees his own predilections expressed in the later Schelling. The courage to be is therefore the principle of ac-

---

[14] New Haven, Yale University Press, 1952.

ceptance which takes place in this personal center, which denies moralism and intellectualism but transcends and unites mysticism and personalism. "The courage to be is to accept one's self as accepted in spite of being unacceptable" (p. 164). By means of acceptance man achieves participation in the drama of salvation. The principle of acceptance replaces the objective formulas of justification by faith and forgiveness of sins. This courage to be creates an "idea of God which transcends mysticism and the person-to-person encounter" (p. 178). "Courage has revealing power" (p. 181). The church has the task of mediating this courage, and the significance of the Cross consists in the fact that the God of the Crucified "remained his God after the God of confidence had left him in the darkness of doubt and meaninglessness" (p. 188).

These examples may suffice to give a general view of the present state of the discussion. They could be easily increased by any number of further examples, all resting on the same presuppositions. Common to all these efforts is a demand to grant man the place he deserves in pastoral theology and to allow him existential participation in his own salvation. This is to take place through a program of interpretation which relies primarily on the "practical wisdom" and the concept of man of secular philosophy or psychology. The general attempt is to effect a reconciliation between theology and psychology. All this, however, is nothing entirely new in the history of theology; these efforts have been strenuously carried on since the beginning of modern times. For this reason we have placed our observations in historical perspective in order to achieve a more objective view of the present. It may now be permitted to question some of the basic presuppositions already mentioned from various points of view.

1. The approach of modern literature in the field of pastoral theology is basically apologetic, this means—to employ a definition of Karl Barth—the attempt to prove by means of thought and language that the regnant principles of philosophy, science, or history at a given time, if they do not exactly demand, certainly do not exclude theological propositions based on revelation or on faith. Apologetics demonstrate to a given period, in bolder cases, the intellectual necessity, in more cautious cases, the intellectual respectability of principles derived from the Bible or ecclesiastical dogma. Our area is more or less characterized by the findings of modern psychology and we can clearly observe the constant endeavor of pastoral theology to demonstrate to psychologists the necessity or at least the possibility of Christian doctrine. This often leads on the theological side to considerable reductions of Christian teaching; where the dogma is fully preserved, religion is more or less degraded to the position of a hand-maid in the psychotherapeutic healing process. To a certain extent God is smuggled in by the back door. We must ask whether a responsible pastoral theology may allow this. Is there no place in pastoral theology for the biblical principle that the wisdom of God is necessarily foolishness to the world? That wherever the gospel is proclaimed, it means at the same time judgment and

crisis for man? Is not the judgmental character of the gospel neglected when we speak only of the healing powers of the gospel? Are we not supporting by this the basic sin of mankind—the attempt for self-affirmation in front of God? This leads us to a second point.

2. The point of departure of the writers described is anthropocentric. First, man is studied, a concept of man is developed, and the needs and quandaries of man are brought into focus; and then from this point follows the endeavor to push on to God. Here we may ask, however, whether when one begins with anthropology one may not at least run the danger of ending with it. Is it not possible that here the religious consciousness, i.e., certain psychological patterns of behavior and conduct, has itself all unnoticed become the theme of pastoral theology instead of the work of the Holy Ghost?

3. All these writers have one thing in common: a completely lacking or unsatisfactory relationship to history. One cannot help but think of the famous statement that not accidental historical truth, but only eternal truth of reason, is valid when one observes the striving effort to "interpret" the saving events of history in terms of timeless principles. The event of creation is altered to the eternal principle of human freedom; the historical act of redemption in Christ becomes the timeless principle of acceptance; the act of sanctification through the Holy Spirit changes into the timeless principles of psychological maturation and love. We may ask if there is not a danger if someone has the timeless principles, the saving acts of history may be dismissed, or that where they are preserved they may be assigned a subordinate role. Does this not cut the ground from under pastoral theology? How does it differ any longer from secular psychotherapy?

4. Today there is a widespread opinion that pastoral care and psychotherapy pursue the same goal. This aim is especially seen in the elimination "of disturbance of contact or communication with one's fellow man."[15] This ability to communicate is of special significance because "contact with our fellow man is a constant singularization of our contact with God" (*ibid.*). In other words, it is by human example that God takes on meaningful proportions in a human life. How can one who has never experienced the love of a father understand the love of God? So runs the argument. But isn't this inference from human qualities and behavior to divine qualities and behavior a classical illustration of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the *analogia entis* which reverses the divine economy of salvation? Must all people who do not enjoy such an experience on the human level be excluded from salvation? Is not the reverse the case; that all human love receives its content and meaning through the love of God revealed and offered through the Cross of Christ?

---

[15] J. H. van der Berg: "Pastoral Care and Psychotherapy," in *Student World*, Vol. I, 1954, p. 85.

5. The question which pastoral theology must deal with in this situation is whether pastoral theology can allow itself to be so greatly impressed by the findings of modern psychology that it sacrifices its freedom and finds itself restricted by purely human necessities and limitations. Those psychologists with greater insight are today coming more and more to the realizaation that there is one thing which psychology cannot do—psychology cannot construct a general, valid, and binding concept of man. Psychology can measure and register subconscious drives, it can investigate human behavior patterns and describe man in parts, but psychology is unable to say what man actually is. We must very seriously ask whether there is really any possibility of talking at all about Man as a whole apart from his relationship with God. If this question is answered negatively, pastoral theology must face the problem of formulating a strictly theological anthropology with new seriousness. Karl Barth's forceful work in this field in *Kirchliche Dogmatik,* III, 2, should not be overlooked, and the inspiration which the Swiss psychiatrist Theodor Bovet has drawn from this work and which has borne fruit in his studies may point the way for the future development.[16]

6. A last point may be mentioned. Pastoral care undoubtedly falls short when it limits itself to a framework of purely human practices and techniques. It must be conscious about the fact that what takes place in pastoral care constantly transcends human possibilities. Pastoral care must lead man beyond himself. It is part of the gigantic struggle between God and Satan. As such, it is a battle with daemonic reality. That is the threatening element in its situation. On the other hand, pastoral care is not left alone in this struggle. It can only be understood in its full dimension as a function of the Holy Spirit. As such, it has the character of a miracle and it becomes an eschatological event in that it is centered on and directed toward the final and complete victory of Christ. Since it is rooted in the historical event of Christ, it can be fully understood only in reference to the final end of history brought up by Christ's second coming. In this sense, pastoral theology is always theology and it must take care that it does not betray its own subject but remain true and genuine theology. Thus pastoral theology can escape from the danger of being under the captivity of secular philosophy or psychology.

---

[16] Theodor Bovet: *Lebendige Seelsorge;* Tubingen, Katzmann, 1952.

SOME THEOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION

THE REV. ERNEST E. BRUDER

Protestant Chaplain, Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C.

Obviously, with a subject like this, one could go almost anywhere. When dealing with theological considerations before this group, being a Protestant offers almost limitless latitude. And when one gets into the area of what clinical pastoral education *really* is (and here I would distinguish between what has been written *about* clinical training and the setting-forth of clear-cut descriptive statements of a *process* with specific goals and methodology), we already know how much we differ among ourselves. Thus it might be helpful at the outset to delimit the subject of this paper and to provide some sort of outline structure for what is to be attempted.

This paper can be outlined very briefly. In the first place, the author will present his understanding of the meaning of clinical pastoral training as it has developed at Saint Elizabeths—a mental hospital. From this we shall move on to a consideration of certain basic concerns which have appeared with increasing frequency, both about the programs and about the students in the programs. Finally, an attempt will be made, on the basis of the kind of experience delineated in the paper, to offer some specific theological considerations.

The material presented here has come out of actual pastoral work as a hospital chaplain and supervisor. Thus, both as a chaplain and as a supervisor, the writer has available a body of experience with patients, with seminary students, and with other professional workers that is seldom found in any other setting. This work has raised numerous questions as attempts were made to proclaim the Good News of God as it had become personally meaningful. It is felt that these same questions will not only be of interest but of vital concern to all who have some direct responsibility in the training of others for the Christian ministry. Sharing these concerns then becomes an obligation as well as a privilege. There is no other justification for this paper.

It might be well to raise the question as to *why* the hospital offers a course in clinical pastoral education. Many answers can be given—depending on individual hospital superintendents, chaplains, institutions—and

---

Presented at the Fourth Annual National Conference on Clinical Pastoral Training at McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, on Tuesday, October 13, 1953.

the kind of experience all have had with such programs. Here we attempt no definite answer, but we do want to offer something of what we have learned.

We feel very strongly that the mental hospital has a vast and rich body of experience that is greatly needed by the community. This covers a wide territory, but its common denominator is knowledge: In short, this is the way things are in certain kinds of living, and, where this is known, something constructive might be done about one's living. Without such knowledge the inevitable difficulties of living are repeated time and time again. The hospital feels an obligation to share with community educators what it has discovered about human behavior which will in turn benefit the community at large.

The hospital is a place where the student can obtain first-hand understanding about mental illness. (What is said here applies, of course, to any progressive, therapeutically and educationally oriented institution, be it mental or general hospital, or prison.) The questions that are implicit when considering mental illness are almost limitless. Who is this person who became mentally ill? What do we know about him before it happened? What is this thing called mental illness, insofar as we can offer any general understanding? What can be done for mentally ill people to help them get well? What are the problems we run into in working with them? Above all, where does the chaplain fit into the picture? What can he do, how does he do it, what are his special understandings, if any? And, of course, not the least of the student's opportunities is his being brought into direct contact with many psychiatrists. This forces some kind of resolution of the question, which to some students has been quite vexing, as to whether psychiatry and religion are basically opposed.

In a sense, the hospital has a two-fold objective in such programs. On the one hand, it is possible to clarify and at times to eradicate what so frequently are found to be mistaken ideas both about mental illness and psychiatry. But even more important from the hospital's viewpoint is the fact that, having had an opportunity to inform future leaders of the community about something of what is known to lead to mental ill-health, a great step has been taken in the direction of preventing mental illness.

The methods of achieving the immediate goals in clinical pastoral education as far as the hospital is concerned are readily demonstrable. These are: first-hand contact with patients, lectures and seminars, participation in worship, and personal conferences, to specify only the most outstanding media. The goals from the viewpoint of the chaplain-supervisor inevitably go beyond, though they are rooted in, those of the hospital. These might well be termed ultimate concerns, for they focus sharply on what the clinical experience comes to mean to the student as a person. It is in this area that the theological implications of the program become apparent.

As has been reported elsewhere, though only very briefly (*Journal of*

Pastoral Care, Spring, 1952, "Clinical Training and the Student"), and from some published evaluations of the training experience by four former students (same issue of *Journal*), the most distinctive characteristic of clinical pastoral education is its highly individualized or personalized meaning. Some students have referred to it as "a life-giving experience," or in similar terms. Most have agreed that it was something which had touched them in ways which little else had ever done. Its most significant meaning was not in knowledge obtained, or techniques developed, but in the changes effected in the student.

In a sense, our findings merely confirm the understandings reported previously and known to supervisors who have had direct responsibility for the conduct of programs according to the standards of The Council for Clinical Training. It has come to be almost axiomatic for a supervisor to look for "changes" in the student as a result of the training experience. Without such "changes" it would be well to suspect the efficacy of the program. But having said this, it is necessary to offer a cautionary word.

It is one thing to look for and expect "changes" in a student—it is quite another to hold this forth as a direct goal of the program. It cannot be emphasized enough that personal insight, to the point of effective change in a student's behavior patterns, can never be a direct aim of our programs. These are the inevitable (and hoped for) end results. If aimed at directly, they are never achieved, for, as the Scripture suggests, "He that seeketh to find his life shall lose it . . . " Such results can come about only when the student has been able to immerse himself successfully in the program: in the daily patient contacts, the give and take of seminar discussion, the consultations with staff personnel, the attendance at staff conferences and lectures, and the personal conferences with his chaplain-supervisor. To do so, especially in the mental hospital, is to find one's self personally involved. The inevitable by-products of such activity are an increased awareness of one's own interpersonal operations and a consequent drive in the direction of both constructive and durable change. Such effects can go by a variety of names, but one thing at least is inescapable—that a student knows he has been through something in which he has participated in a way quite unique in his experience.

Perhaps it should be added that such personal involvement, which has been pointed to as highly desirable, is equally inescapable. To spend three months in a situation where all those around you (staff, patients, fellow students, and supervisors) are constantly preoccupied with the problems of those caught in the toils of emotional travail is to find that you have concerns hitherto unsuspected. Try as one will, it is next to impossible—and according to our understanding, to miss one of the most significant of our educational opportunities—for the student to avoid confronting himself with a new honesty. When this happens, there is concomitant anxiety, and the need to share with *others* the concerns this anxiety usually precipitates. Hence we have developed within our programs what we have chosen to call

"group concerns seminars" the purpose of which is frankly stated to be that of ventilating any and all concerns the individuals may have and which have been precipitated by the training experience. The therapeutic value of these group sessions (one and a half hours each, twice a week) is quite remarkable and has been attested to by such pioneer reporters as Dr. Robert C. Leslie. But let us repeat: The personal insights gained by the student as a result of these group concerns seminars are a *by-product* of the discussion and sharing of his experiences as a student in the hospital. What he shares are his questions, doubts, perplexities, affirmations, hopes, and fears—the whole gamut of the new experience—with others caught, as he is himself caught, in the newness of the experience. In short, what he shares are his *feelings*—which in our culture everything seems to restrict his doing—and hence he shares from the depth of *himself*. It is only to be expected that such new and stirring experiences should effect change in the individual's personality structure.

Basic Concerns Relative to Students and Programs

One of the outstanding characteristics noticed about a great many of the students when they first begin clinical training is the difficulty they have in participating personally. Being in a mental hospital is obviously a new experience for them; practically everything about the training program is an unexplored but fascinating region; and there are literally innumerable questions about everything they see and hear and do from the very first moment they set foot in the institution. The amazing thing is their hesitancy and at times downright refusal to explore these new areas, in spite of the fact that such activity is not only indicated but urged by many members of the professional staff.

To illustrate what is meant here, two brief examples may be cited. In the first place, many of the students seem unable to show any curiosity. Some even go so far as to object strenuously when it is advocated in lectures or seminars that without curiosity little learning is possible. They maintain that to be curious about how the mentally ill patient came to be that way would be to manifest a non-Christian attitude.

Another manifestation of this seems to be a strong dependency characteristic. This is seen in the student who constantly requests his supervisor *to tell him* what to do; whom to see; how long his visits are to be; how long to make his written interviews; what to put into his Weekly Impressions Sheets; etc. It is obviously caricatured in the student who denied a patient's request for prayer with, "I can't; we haven't come to that yet in the program."

The implications of this, and other characteristics to be mentioned later, will be discussed further on in the paper. However, here it ought to be emphasized that many of these students who find considerable difficulty in being curious, and tend to rely heavily on the authority of others, can and

do frequently change during the program. This change is usually evidenced in a more free and spontaneous interaction and with noticeable indications of an enhanced ability to communicate intelligibly with others.

Another aspect of this lack of personal participation is seen in the student who becomes theologically defensive. This characteristic is shown in various ways. It may be expressed by a student when he criticizes his supervisor for having no theology when the supervisor refuses to be drawn into such discussion in the process of clarifying with the student a certain student-patient relationship. One can guess at it when a student interrupts, and sometimes destroys, the communication of another student who is trying to understand what he has witnessed, by some such label as "humanism" or "logical positivism" or "liberal Christianity" or even, though more rarely these days, "social gospel."

A student who seeks to defend a theological position is often one who remains most unapproachable throughout the training. This supervisor at least has to admit to having learned no easy and readily usable method by which such individuals can be approached as persons.

Since a theologically defensive student usually has only one year of seminary behind him, and therefore knows very little theology, it is suspected that such behavior probably is a highly defensive maneuver to keep his personal armor intact. The ludicrousness of the student's position was well illustrated one summer when a colleague rather facetiously summarized for the students what seemed to have been going on in the following words: "You are going to defend a theology which you admit you won't get until your next year in seminary, against our theology which you accuse us of never having revealed." The whole matter becomes all the more complicated—unless one views this as a defensive maneuver—when we learn, as we did from the professor of theology of the seminary from which the majority of these students came, that the following year they spent their time in his classes *defending psychiatry*.

In passing, it might be well to draw attention to the impression that students from communions (or groups within these communions) noted for their theological and liturgical specificity are the ones who most frequently exhibit this inhibition of personal participation.

In such training programs one frequently sees the development and expression of hostile feelings. These feelings, seen as anger or resentment or irritation, are directed usually either at the supervisory staff or at individual students, or at both. They will be voiced as a lack of confidence in the supervisor's understanding or competence or in his ability to handle group activity. Within the group, and directed at specific individuals, they may be voiced as criticisms of what another may say, questioning the motives behind certain comments, or the open expression of anger when defenses have been directly challenged.

These feelings are cited here not as being significant in themselves. What is important is that these feelings are expressed within the group structure, sometimes to the point where individuals within the group who never knew that they harbored such feelings found themselves expressing them. Furthermore, the very individuals who had expressed these feelings found that, contrary to their expectations, they were not isolated by the group, but in some manner the honest sharing of feeling had resulted in a new cohesive quality which made for much more satisfying group activity.

As one would gather from the illustration just given, during the course of training a marked feeling of fellowship develops within the group. By this is not meant that everything is sort of "buddy-buddy." Intra-group tensions are by no means eliminated. But in a very marked sense one comes to get the feeling that there has developed a deep sense of meaningfulness, and that one is able to share at least in a way not possible before, vitally important aspects of living. Perhaps this is but another way of indicating that as individuals the group members have found an acceptance which no longer keeps communication on a merely intellectual level.

Frequently one learns from students toward the end of the training program that they have found a new interest in church doctrine and the reading of the Scriptures. Some students have been quite explicit in stating that they now were able to read the Scriptures with interest and even fascination. Doctrines which had hitherto been little more than creedal affirmations to which they were expected to give assent, suddenly presented new and enlightening perspectives on centuries-old penetrating insights on the relationship of God and man. From responses such as these one could confidently expect that the student would no longer respond to the preparation of a sermon as the "need to say something," but as a challenge to preach because "I have something to say." It is indeed a thrilling experience to be able to witness again and again the "coming alive" for a student of ancient truth, and the liberating effect that such truth can have on hitherto moribund interpersonal relations.

One other impression about the student's reaction needs to be shared. As a result of having had the highly personal experience indicated, the student becomes rather vividly, and sometimes painfully, aware of his need to explore more deeply his interpersonal relations. With some frequency we have been called upon to arrange for students to follow up their clinical training experience with intensive psychotherapy. There is enough evidence already available that such constructive action on the part of the student, motivated because he has become aware of personal impediments in his dealings with others, has resulted in a much more effective pastoral ministry after ordination. In spite of the fears expressed in some quarters, such referral for therapy does not increase the number of students who leave the ministry. On the contrary, it appears to support the initial resolve for such a vocation and clarifies for the individual some of his more basic motiva-

tions. This leaves him less liable to express these motivations in ways unknown to himself and at the expense of his parishioners.

In all fairness, in this connection, it should be added that the training experience has served another purpose. It is not unusual that students begin to have serious questions as to their motivations for entering the ministry. By and large, this has not proven too great a problem with the majority. But there have been significant exceptions who, as a result of the permissive and accepting atmosphere of the program, have dared to admit that they never really wanted to be in the ministry at all. Most frequently in such cases the reasons for the original decision were the inability to withstand the demands of an aggressive mother, the unintelligent urging of an older minister, or the intolerable pressure of unresolved guilts. In the training this became clear to the student, and he was helped to seek out new vocational goals. What this has meant both to the student and to his future congregations seems obvious.

By and large, up to now we have concentrated on the impressions of the student's reaction to training. A word should be said about the program itself and the character of the supervision offered.

In the first place, after considerable experimentation, during which we moved from one end of the scale to the other, we have finally settled on a program that is rather highly structured. It has been found, as already suggested, that the student shows considerable personal anxiety in the early part of the training experience. This may be due to the newness of the experience, or to the fact that he is uncomfortable about what this is going to tell him about himself (the student who comes from a seminary where clinical pastoral training is well known), or he may be afraid of being attacked by patients, or it may be that for the first time he is expected to be more of himself than ever had been possible before. In any case, he is anxious, and this anxiety is demonstrated in a variety of ways. It has been our experience that simply to throw the hospital, patients, staff, conferences, seminars, etc., open, with no guide-lines at all, is to induce not growth but rather panic in most of the students. Not all students—just most! There are some mature souls (how few they are!) who thrive on an experience like this; it is like water to a thirsty traveler. The rapidity of their growth is remarkable. But for the others, structure and direction are indispensable if there is to be any future growth.

Thus in our programs we make it clear that there are some specific demands—for example, reports on Initial Religious Interviews, a summary of the weekly activities of the student, and a draft of a sermon which he proposes to preach to the patients—if he elects to preach. We make it quite clear at the beginning of the program that we *expect* a very great deal of the student, for there is not only much to learn, but much that needs to be learned. And so the program is carefully delineated as to lectures, seminars, conferences, time for patient visits or other patient activities.

What the student does with this, other than in the specific demands already indicated, is up to him on very much the same basis as would be any graduate experience.

Further, in both seminars and personal conferences a considerable directiveness is offered. The student is not encouraged to ventilate personal feelings or simply to "free associate," but to concentrate on patient or other relationships which have raised some questions for him. We conceive the essence of the supervisors' function to consist in clarifying with the student how he relates to others. We clearly accept that we have a body of knowledge about this area of human experience which would be invaluable to the student in his future ministry. Thus we make a rather determined attempt to offer it to the student. However, it should be added, if we find that students cannot avoid a preoccupation with personal concerns, strictly training objectives are dropped, and the student is either worked with in a counseling relationship, or he is referred for therapy. Then the values originally recognized by pioneering supervisors in "free discussion" seminars are preserved in the group concerns seminars. In these, as has been indicated, the student is allowed ample opportunity to discuss whatever he wants to discuss. Hence the *primary focus* of concern is always the student. But there is some acceptance of the fact that the supervisor might occasionally know something of what is going to be helpful or non-helpful to the student in his preparation for the pastoral role.

We feel strongly that it is asking too much of most students, coming as they do from an authoritarian atmosphere (be it home, college or seminary), to be expected or pushed into venturing forth on their own. This is the road to panic—not learning. This is not permissiveness, but uncertain and confused supervision. It simply isn't fair to the student. In such programs not only does the student suffer, but so does the supervisor.

Some Specific Theological Considerations

The material so far presented is replete with theological implications. The plea to view clinical pastoral training as *education,* in the real and deeply religious sense of the word, is basic. The positive affirmation of the integrity of the individual—be he patient, student, supervisor, or other staff member—is stressed. Implicit is the understanding that it is not what is done *to* and *for* another, but what one *is,* which enables him to bring forth his latent creative and unique capacities as a "child of God . . . for whom Christ died!" An attempt will now be made to spell out more specifically just what this has meant in terms of the theological orientation of the speaker.

It would appear from all this that certain theological truths become evident. In the first place, there is assumed with devastating finality the *spiritual emancipation of the individual*—be it from psychological or religious dogmas, the coercion of home or supervisor—as free to participate

in his own development *before God.* In a time when we are beset with the incessant pressures of what Rollo May has described as the "radar directed person" [1]—so sensitive to the demands of the outside world that he has become almost numb to the voice of God within—we need again to be reminded of this ancient, though double-edged, truth. It requires all the wisdom and courage of deep personal certainty to be able to meet the authoritarian demands of anxiety with the calm assurance contained in the authority of personal witness. It calls forth in the supervisor a deep and abiding conviction "in those things most surely believed" to enable him to withstand the constant temptation to violate the spiritual integrity of the student. His task has been completed when he has shared as fully as he can the deeply meaningful things of his experience *when the student has shown evidences of being able and ready to bear such communication.* It is here that we must speak with authority—the authority of experience.

Our task as supervisors, before God, is not to persuade the student in any direction. Our solemn responsibility is to make clear to the student, though most often through the wreckage of human behavior, the compelling witness of man's need for love and affection, tenderness and understanding, acceptance, reconciliation and belongingness—in short, the eternal and ever-liberating Good News proclaimed by our Lord Jesus Christ. It is our privilege to share in whatever ways we best can the spiritual realities of our own living as we carry on daily in the hospital. It is our task to do this so well that the student is left *free* to accept or reject what is offered! This we most surely believe.

In like manner what has been said underscores the *primacy of experience* as the criterion to understanding and freedom. It is sometimes most shattering for the student to come to realize that when he meets patients he has literally nothing to offer *but himself.* He knows nothing of the complicated needs of the mentally ill patient. He knows not how to pray in the midst of such threatening and uncomfortable experiences. He is literally thrown back on himself. This is truly humbling, for then he has nowhere to go but to God. He has no other resource than the Ground of His Being. With understanding supervision, if his background has not been too impoverished, the student can soon come to appreciate that the greatest gift that he has to offer is the gift of himself. As he seeks to understand what has happened to the one he visits; as he seeks through listening and patience to hear of the loneliness and suffering and pain which has been borne by the other—so he offers himself to the patient and comes to know deeply and timelessly the truth of Jesus' words, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me."

It is only when the student has developed his capacity toward self-awareness—when he has entered into his joys and sorrows, his loves and

---

[1] *Man's Search for Himself*: Rollo May, Norton, New York, 1953, p. 187.

hates, his certainties and fears, his successes and failures—that he can truly be himself. And he can enter these life-giving experiences only insofar as he enters into relationship with others, patients, fellow students, supervisors, etc. Insofar as he does these things—which cannot be done outside of relationship—he gains experience. As he gains experience he tests the validity of his experience and increasingly plumbs the depths of his being—and cannot evade the Ground of his Being.

It is precisely when he has been encouraged to do this, and has been able to enter into it, that the truth of what has been said of his new understandings concerning the Scriptures becomes clear. Having truly gained the *courage to be,* he is able to enter meaningfully into the being of others. With this enlightened freedom he comes to see the Holy Scriptures for what they really are—the agonizing record of man's eternal search for God: and God's unceasing quest for man—and their meeting (reconciliation) in Christ Jesus. Having ventured forth into the arena of love and hate, hope and despair, salvation and sin— allowing *himself* to be what *he* is, no matter what—may be a terrifying experience, but it brings him inevitably to God. It is where we have had the courage to see the flesh—where we have had the courage to be flesh—to see ourselves clearly, steadily and as a whole—that we meet God. "The Word indeed became flesh and dwelt among us . . . for God was in Christ reconciling us unto Himself." This we most surely believe.

What does it mean to be able to do this? This brings us to another great truth—that the individual is made whole only insofar as he has *become at one with God.* This has been perhaps most meaningfully expressed for us in that we are "justified by our faith." Not what we do or say—not what formula or methodology—but by a living relationship with a living Being. "Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." It is where we have found acceptance—where our deep dignity as striving toward God is recognized, no matter what we may *show*—where we have found a new relationship—that we become whole, or are saved. This can be only where we have known patience, consideration, friendliness, concern—somebody reaching out seeking to know something of what has happened to us—where indeed the understood Truth of the Ages—the Word—becomes flesh!

What does this mean in everyday experience? Many things, of course! But not the least of these is to know that we are accepted before God as we are. We are sure that we do not have to give up part of ourselves before we come to know love. We even dare to believe that we can come "Just as I am . . . " *Sin and all.* God does not require that we give up our sin before we come to Him. It is our glory and triumph that He wants us and needs us, sin and all. Indeed, our sinful nature being what it is in some peculiar way makes us what we are—and this is what we have to offer to God. It is our strong feeling that as Christians we are never truly asked to give *up* our sinful natures—but to give them *to* God. "In

His service *we* find perfect freedom." When we remember that *before God* Jonah is reported to have spat out the words, "I do well to be angry," and suffered no rebuke; and that Our Lord Himself on the Cross—*before God*—could accusingly cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me . . . " and yet receive an Eternal Acceptance from the Father—then it is to know that there is indeed "nothing that can separate us from the love of God which we have seen in Christ Jesus." When we are in the hospital such experience and such truth are inescapable. When we are truly ourselves we know that we are accepted before God. This we most surely believe.

There remains space to point but to one more great truth validated by our experience. It has already been mentioned that such an experience as clinical pastoral training achieves for the group a remarkable sense of fellowship. Sometimes this is so much so that, when a reasonably large group of students in a given center come from a single seminary, they often go back to the seminary and make an attempt to retain something of the group life they had during summer—to the discomfiture of both other students and faculty alike. This would testify not only to the vitalty of the experience, but in the inherent need we all have to share meaningfully together, and *in community,* the deeply significant things of human living. Of such is the essence of fellowship.

We have long known about the Church as a holy community or as the fellowship of believers. Our experience merely underscores the truth of this ancient witness concerning the Body of Christ, and would bear testimony to the reality of this experience. When a group meets together in a common purpose, to know something about another area of human living, and shares with itself the feelings involved in this new exploration, there is indeed a new creation. Something unique has happened—account for it as you will. When the individuals of this group come together not only to know about this new area of experience, but in relationship to the Ultimate which is devoutly and most certainly believed—and affirm this in terms of the living faith of the Lord Jesus Christ—then the Body of Christ is alive. Where we seek together some of the inevitable pain of life, to face together our very togetherness—our separation, loneliness, and longing—to find the meaning of life, we are met together in His name. And there He is also! This we most surely believe!

Interestingly enough, where a group has become a unity, the fact that various members of the group represented Baptist, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopal, etc., persuasions did not hinder the essential oneness achieved. On the contrary, it enriched it, and as such points to the rich hopes in ecumenicity. For if clinical training is anything it is a unique and meaningful experiment in ecumenicity.

This means that prayer takes on new meaning, as does worship, the sacraments, the liturgical symbols of the ages, in fact all the rich treasures

which we have received. These can no longer be accepted with mere formality. Having shaken off the shackles which have bound our individual creativity we can no longer be satisfied until we have entered fully into these joyful mysteries.

In conclusion, I am not unmindful of the implications of an ancient truth—that there is nothing definitive about what has been said, but at least it does not remain unsaid. If there is anything needed in the theological realm today, it is the reformulation of ancient truth in the light of psychological understanding. All else—and there is much of it—is, to use a phrase from the Bishop of Birmingham—"clever and sterile thought coming from tiresome specialists . . . (and) makes no appeal to men and women of modern education sick at heart with the dangers and perplexities that surround them." [2] There is, of course, one outstanding, if not the only, exception to this—Dr. Paul Tillich, who has had the courage to say, in his autobiographical reflections: "I do not think that it is possible today to elaborate a Christian doctrine of man, and especially a Christian doctrine of the Christian man, without using the immense material brought forth by depth psychology." [3]

The fact remains that only as we pool our common experiences and share our uniqueness as individuals through a deep and humble conviction of the truth we have *lived,* in a common bond of fellowship that gives us courage to affirm ourselves, can we fully enter into the divine truth which has been given us. This we need—and this is demanded of us by the very perplexities of our age.

---

[2] *Religion and Turmoil*: Ernest William Barnes, "The Rede Lecture," given at Cambridge University, 1949, p. 36.

[3] *The Theology of Paul Tillich*: Edited by Charles W. Kegley and Robert W. Bretall; New York, Macmillan, 1952, p. 19.

KING DAVID'S ANGER

HENRY P. LAUGHLIN, M.D.

Practicing Psychoanalyst and Psychiatrist and Member of the Faculty of the Department of Psychiatry, George Washington University Medical School, Washington, D. C.

For the original account of "King David's anger," we turn to the familiar biblical story of David and Bathsheba.[1] David spied the beautiful Bathsheba bathing while her husband Uriah was away at war in the King's service. David took Bathsheba for himself and arranged for Uriah to be killed on the battlefield. Nathan, the wise prophet, forcibly pointed out the King's conduct to him by a parable.

> There were two men in one city, the one rich and the other poor. The rich man had exceeded many flocks and herds. But the poor man had nothing, save one little ewe. . . . It grew up together with him . . . eating of his own meat and drinking from his own cup, and lay in his bosom and was unto him as a daughter.
>
> A traveler came to visit the rich man; but the rich man would not prepare for him an animal from his own large herds. Instead he took the poor man's lamb.

The King's reaction to hearing this parable was immediate and strong: ". . . David's anger was greatly kindled against the man; and he said to Nathan, . . . 'As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this thing shall surely die. And he shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing and because he had no pity.'

"And Nathan said to David, 'Thou art the man.' . . ."

The pitiless and powerful rich man, as described by Nathan, kindled great anger in the heart of David. In other circumstances he might have had some hostile feelings toward the rich man—even as we might also.

Reprinted with permission from *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly,* Vol. XXIII, No. 1, 1954, published by The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, Inc., 57 West 57th Street, New York 19, New York.

Read at the annual meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, 1952, and before the Maryland Psychiatric Society and the Southern Psychiatric Association.

Acknowledgment is made to Dr. Sidney Berman, Dr. Jean G. N. Cushing, Dr. George C. Ham, Dr. Robert T. Morse, Dr. Wendell S. Muncie, and Dr. Douglas Noble for their helpful comments and discussion.

[1] II Samuel, 11, 12.

It is unlikely, however, that such intensity of anger—accompanied by a judgment of death for the offender—would ordinarily appear in a person accustomed to being judge and hearing frequent recitals of all manner of crimes. This is so despite the relatively greater seriousness of wrongdoing involving livestock in a largely pastoral people.

It seems clear that David's real anger was toward himself. He already bore a large burden of self-disapproval, which he may have attempted to deny, for his actions with Bathsheba and Uriah. This repressed condemnation of himself could be freely expressed as hostility toward the rich man in whom unconsciously he saw himself. The harsh judgment resulted. Nathan wisely, perhaps intuitively, understood this and so constructed the parable that David was made to recognize consciously how much he really disapproved of what he had done.

This anger and indignation of David toward the rich man is the classical example of a clinical and social phenomenon which is fairly common in less striking forms.

It often happens that we suppress awareness of disapproved traits or behavior in ourselves and at the same time have an acute or even hyperacute awareness of and condemnation for the same traits or behavior in others. We see such suppression of awareness, for example, in the driver who condemns others for the same errors on the road that he is oblivious to in himself, and in the business man who denounces others as slow to pay their bills, forgetting his own occasional delinquency in repayment of loans. In other more marked instances the disapproved segment of oneself is repressed, and this repression may be accompanied by conscious forces in direct opposition to the repressed drives. For example, the person with a strong, repressed homosexual drive often is particularly vigorous in his denunciation of homosexuals. At times such persons have led campaigns against homosexuals in civil and military life. It is not entirely by accident that certain enforcement officers are selected by homosexuals for advances which lead to their apprehension. Here the outward and conscious efforts re-enforce the repression.

Attributes or motives may be assigned to another person by projection. These may be approved or disapproved characteristics of oneself. This projection may be facilitated when identification occurs because of unrecognized physical resemblances or similarities of character and behavior.

These two processes, suppression or repression of self-criticism and projection, are combined in "King David's anger," which may be defined as *a reaction in which the unconscious disapproved segment of oneself is consciously experienced as dislike for another.* X unconsciously recognizes similarities to himself in appearance, character, and behavior, in varying proportions, in Y. X then unconsciously identifies himself with Y. X has conscious feelings only of unexplained dislike for Y; he has unconsciously transferred some of his own self-disapproval to Y. In this manner the

hostility and negative feelings may more "safely" be allowed expression than if they were directed against the self. The dislike of X for Y can amount to hatred, disgust, or revulsion. Aware only that he dislikes Y, X may rationalize this dislike by imputing to Y undesirable motives, attributes, or feelings. Careful observation will often reveal that these characteristics imputed to Y are in reality the very qualities that X unconsciously recognizes and disapproves of in himself. He projects them upon Y.

Concealing recognition from ourselves of something we disapprove is protectively intended. But regardless of the degree of success of repression, it is doubtful whether we really achieve freedom from self-disapproval. Successful repression of the cause may instead leave us with unattached self-critical feelings. They contribute to the lowering of self-esteem. When the cause is lost to consciousness, its recall is a prerequisite to resolution.

Sometimes pointing out this reaction may be helpful in treatment.

A thirty-five-year-old patient brought an alumni bulletin to a treatment hour. Showing me a picture of a man of about his own age, he expressed the inexplicable repugnance he felt toward the man pictured—hitherto unknown to him. The picture was of a rather pleasant but determined-appearing person with strong features and a prominent high-bridged nose. He was cited for his work in directing a fund-raising campaign. There was a distinct physical resemblance to the patient, of which he was not aware. Speculating about his repugnance, the patient thought the man too aggressive, contemptuous of others, too much interested in money, and one who would bear watching as a sharp dealer. Perhaps his success in the campaign was due to chicanery.

When I told my patient of the similarity in appearance, I was met with denial. His initial strong resistance to seeing the likeness gradually turned into surprised recognition. Only after some time was he able to understand that he had transferred parts of his own self-disapproval to the man pictured. The characteristics ascribed to the unknown man were actually his own. Unconscious recognition of the physical resemblance led to identification. The patient's attributing his own unlikable characteristics to the man seemingly occurred as a rationalization of the otherwise unexplained feelings. Understanding this process was an important milestone in his therapy.

A brilliant professional worker, although highly competent in his field, alienated many influential people by difficult character traits. He pushed people aside, misused power, and secured special privileges. All this he attempted to keep acceptable to himself since "the end justifies the means." He resisted awareness of the destructive effects to himself and to others. One day he reported to his therapist[2] his resentment toward an entertainer. In angry tones he described the singer as forward, overbearing, and subjugating other singers; as seeking power and position at the ex-

[2] Dr. Lester L. Burtnick, who contributed this example.

pense of others; and as striving for status. These traits he repeatedly condemned in strong terms.

The patient was able to acknowledge his facial resemblance to the singer. He reported the shame he had felt about his own large mouth, particularly in early life. In compensation, he had developed a habit of sucking in his lips. He was much less ready to see how the personality of the singer resembled his own. He was later able to report, however, "It's my resentment toward myself. Something I don't like about me that I'm seeing in him."

Sometimes it is difficult or impossible to secure insight. Attempts to do so may best be deferred, particularly if the initial denial has been violent.

A patient whose personality was marked by aggressiveness, domineering relationships with others, and arbitrary interpretation of regulations, came to a treatment hour visibly agitated. Torn by thinly veiled rage, he described his angry response to the movie, *Detective Story*. His relaxation on entering the movie theater was quickly dissipated with the appearance of Kirk Douglas as the principal actor. Douglas, a middle-sized, athletic, rather serious man, with regular features, who often plays tough "he-man" roles, bore considerable but unrecognized physical resemblance to the patient. In the movie Douglas plays a tough detective, vigorously engaged in stamping out crime. Obsessed by his prejudice against any kind of crime, he is relentless in handling the wrongdoer. The law is dispensed in a highhanded manner.

As the movie progressed, the patient became increasingly enveloped in a bristling cloak of hatred for the detective. He became agitated and could hardly keep his seat. The movie became reality to him. He had ideas and impulses about various kinds of violent death for the detective portrayed. Unable to continue watching, he rushed out. That night he could not sleep. He felt tense and was overheard by others grinding his teeth. He reported with intense feeling how he entertained fantasies of killing the detective. His agitation subsided after several days. It was not considered advisable to deal directly with this episode in therapy. After six or eight months, other data relating to these elements of character structure had been observed. The patient was able to tolerate the incident sufficiently by this time to consider some of its importance to himself.

The patient unconsciously established identification; the physical resemblance responsible was strongly fortified by similarities portrayed in the character on the screen. The rejected part of the patient was seen in the screen characterization which then became the object of his anger. This anger could more safely be recognized in relation to an externalized self. In this instance the response was undoubtedly re-enforced by further identification with the father who had been regarded as dispensing family rules arbitrarily.

Several physicians at a social gathering were watching a television program. When a certain quartet was announced one of the audience became flushed and clenched his fists. Turning his back to the television

set, he stated in angry tones that he could not bear the leader of the quartet. He could not quite understand it, but something about the man was repugnant. As he expressed his strong feelings, the other watchers were struck by the close similarity of appearance in the two men, both of whom have unusual features and mannerisms. The physician told how his dislike had grown until he could no longer stand the sight of the man. He found his voice very disturbing. The audience was startled by the bitterness of his feelings, accompanied as it was by the marked resemblance. The doctor was oblivious to this resemblance.

In other examples, physical resemblance does not exist, or plays only a minor part. Instead, similarities in character traits and behavior initiate an intense response, as in the story of King David.

A patient had reported incidents in which he had "taken the law into his own hands." He had behaved in highly arbitrary fashion, often riding roughshod over others. He defended this behavoir by saying, "this is best for all concerned," or "I know what is really the best thing to do." While visiting the Smithsonian Institution, he heard a guard scolding a group of adolescents for running through the revolving door. He was instantly furious. He wished to assault the guard and could hardly restrain himself. Reporting the incident later, he fumed at the guard for his "misuse of authority." The guard was "crude and loud, and wasn't conducting himself in a way consistent with his position." It was "a breach of dignity." He was "behaving like a bulldozer—riding roughshod over others in a damn arbitrary fashion." Everything had seemed fine that Sunday, "but you know, Doctor, that incident spoiled the whole day for me."[3]

This patient was most resistant to seeing that the hated characteristics he angrily ascribed to the guard were also present in himself. Finally he said, "It was like me talking. It was like me seeing myself in the guard and I guess I was seeing how foolish I looked and what I hated in me." The authoritarian behavior of the guard had triggered the intense emotional response. He hated the guard for manifesting a tendency he unconsciously recognized in himself.

One person may consciously or unconsciously provoke "the King's anger" in another to achieve some end. In the following example an apparently meek and docile patient did so partly to "punish" an aggressor.

A woman patient aged thirty-four was involved in a destructive affair in which she suffered many kinds of indignity. One night she felt "impelled" to tell her friend Joe of an earlier relationship with a man, adding that he had once been convicted of a sexual offense. Joe falsely assumed that the offense had been forcing sexual relations upon a woman. He was instantly furious. He berated the man in harsh and exaggerated terms. The angry tirade was occasionally interrupted to condemn the woman for associating with so evil a person.

---

[3] This example furnished by Dr. Arthur G. Law.

I believe my patient must have been unconsciously aware of the effect her revelation would have on Joe, who had himself forced her into sexual relations several times by violence and threats. He had shown no self-reproach. His anger on this occasion, however, was the external manifestation of his basic attitude toward his own aggressive and punitive behavior. He was reacting to a picture of himself presented to him with intuitive understanding by the patient.

Positive and negative feelings toward another person caused by the King David reaction are usually hard to see. The mechanism is unconscious, and has a protective and defensive function; hence it is difficult to work out with our patients.

Positive responses of a similar kind exist. Narcissus fell in love with his own image, and died unaware that it was his own. Positive responses may be less striking, or perhaps they seem less frequent since they are less disturbing and are taken for granted. Less emotion and conflict are involved about things in ourselves of which we approve.

This suggests the hypothesis that *our attention is selectively directed toward those qualities in others over which we have greatest concern or conflict in ourselves.* This principle may perhaps also in part determine what sorts of person we interest ourselves in.

The King's anger involves a channeling of hostility, the redirection of negative feelings outward. Hatred is drawn away from the infantile, the demanding, the dependent, the disliked parts of ourselves, and from the internalized "bad" parent, and is directed instead with all possible vehemence toward another person. The King David reaction may be regarded as a complex process designed to re-enforce repression.

What are the limits for expression of this projected hatred? King David decided the rich man must die. The patient who identified himself with the detective in the movie entertained fantasies of murder. We know that often the suicide kills himself partly because he feels guilty and hates himself. In murder an unconscious factor can be destruction of the hated but projected segment of the self. This mechanism may enter into the occasional instances where there has been an impulsive murder of a total stranger.

Summary

King David's anger derives its name from the Biblical story of how David was led by a parable to perceive his own iniquity. The King David reaction is a complex psychological process which involves the unconscious employment of several mental mechanisms. These are primarily identification, projection, and rationalization. By their use, repressed self-condemnation and disapproval are transposed into feelings experienced subjectively as dislike for another person. The strength of these feelings may be poorly

understood by the person concerned, who may explain them to himself or to others on the basis of ascribed attributes (projection) which then appear to be the basis for his condemnation and dislike, or even hatred.

This pattern of reaction may also be the basis for certain otherwise unexplained positive feelings and attractions toward another person. In both, the process may be facilitated by unrecognized elements of physical resemblance, as well as by actual similarities in character and personality traits. The King David pattern of reaction is not very common in its more pronounced form, several clinical examples of which have been presented in illustration. Their recognition and interpretation can, however, be useful in psychoanalysis. This reaction can help explain a hypothesis offered as to the selectivity of direction of our interests in and toward other persons.

COUNSELING BY SEMINARIANS

THE REV. WAYNE E. OATES

Associate Professor of Psychology of Religion and Pastoral Theology at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky

The teaching of pastoral counseling is a relatively new addition to the theological curricula of seminaries and divinity schools in this country. The students who come to classes in this subject therefore usually do not have any formal background in the subject, but nevertheless bring many popular and unexamined assumptions to the class with them on the first day.

The professor therefore is confronted with the task of clarifying in his own mind what has been the experience of the student in the actual practice of counseling. A basic principle of teaching seems to me to be that the professor should find out what the student does know about the content of the course and what skills he does have in the practice of counseling before he moves toward giving him new material and suggesting new skills. Otherwise, a professor's teaching will amount to little more than bouncing answers against his students' heads to questions which they have not yet learned to ask. In this event, he simply confuses his students. Or, on the other hand, he may be giving them answers to questions which they have already answered through their own experience. In this event, the students become bored, lose interest, and the morale of the class goes down.

With these convictions in mind, I prepared an open form questionnaire and administered it in my first class period in a class in "The Theory and Practice of Counseling" in order to determine their actual experience in counseling. I did this before any influence of my own teaching had been directly exerted upon them. The findings of these questionnaires are reported here in line with the subject of this paper, inasmuch as most of the counseling was done by student pastors, educational directors, music directors, etc. These results are a part of a larger comparative study I want to make of the kind of counseling done by ministers who are in full-time pastoral work and who have varying degrees of training and experience in the area of personal counseling.

The Instrument of Research

The questionnaire called for three things: (1) a discussion of the social role and function of the student as he or she met the person in need of counseling. Was he a pastor, or was he or she working in an auxiliary role

like that of an educational director, assistant pastor, youth worker, or in some secular task that threw the student into vital counseling contact with the person in need? How old was the student, how much previous training had he had, and how much experience in religious work has he had? (2) What were the conditions under which the student counseled with the person who came to their attention? How did the person come to their attention? What was the place of the first contact, the length of the first conference, the number of follow-up conferences, the amount of time used in all, etc? (3) What was the students' attitude toward, and his interpretation of, the person's problem, and how did he go about dealing with the situation? How did the student evaluate the relationship which he developed in counseling with the person? Was it friendly and secure, or hostile and insecure, etc.?

A Summary of the Results

The Constituency of the Class

The following is an analysis of the student enrollment in the course:

1. The total number of the enrollment was 75; 61 men, 14 women.

2. The educational background was as follows: no college experience, 2; junior college degree, 3; college degree, 67 (A.B., 50; B.S., 15; B.M., 1; Bachelor of Civil Engineering, 1); graduate school degree, 4 (M.A., 2; B.D., 1; B.R.E., 1).

3. The occupational background was as follows: pastoral experience, 42 (total of 125½ years experience); agricultural missionary in Near East; probation officer in juvenile court; YMCA boys' leader; worker in children's hospital, 3; church educational worker, 2; public school teacher, 3; college housemother, 2; beautician; worker in a children's home, 3; church minister of music, 5; evangelist; army officer; junior chemist in local industrial plant; Girl Scout counselor; 4-H Club leader; laboratory technician; church secretary; city recreational worker; physical education instructor in college; psychiatric aides, 4; hospital orderly; printing pressman; instructor in local university (engineering); mail carrier.

The Role and Function of the Class as Counselors

The students were given the privilege of (1) not filling out the questionnaire if they felt that they had not had enough experience, or (2) if they felt that they had had enough experience to fill the questionnaire out, they were asked to say whether they had worked in a specifically *pastoral* type of counseling. The students fall into three different groups: the inexperienced group, the pastoral group, and the non-pastoral group.

The Inexperienced Group. A dramatic response was evident from the start. The questionnaire called (without saying so) for a rather *formal* type of counseling, i.e., the person *asked* for help, *came to* the counselor

rather than being visited by the counselor, and came more than once. Such experiences as these are not uncommon among pastors who are in unusually responsible pastorates, have been in their community long enough to be acquainted with people, and are even moderately interested in personal counseling as such. But this class, being composed of people who have not yet entered such positions, responded quite unexpectedly: Thirty out of the 75 did not report *any* experience at all; 27 of these 30 simply said so in frank, cooperative terms on the paper. Three of these 30 later reported that they had either forgotten the assignment or, in one case, the man said that he at first resented being asked such questions, but later realized that they were important ones.

My own interpretation of these responses is as follows: First, students have a natural reluctance to reveal their counseling situations. Their own low estimate of their own efforts as they compare themselves with persons whom they perceive to be "experts" in almost any area block them. Secondly, students perceived counseling, as they themselves said in later papers, as something that happens quite formally and mechanically, and not on the less formal levels of friendship, comfort, and in short-term casual situations. Thirdly, students are so accustomed to thinking of learning as the retention of other people's ideas that they fail to catch at first the possibility of learning from the analysis of their own behavior in interpersonal relationships. This explains the large number of persons who perceived the questionnaire as irrelevant to them as persons.

Nevertheless, of this group of 30 persons who did not report, some of them reported having had pastoral experience. One man reported having eight years of pastoral experience, but felt that he had never had any opportunities to counsel with his people. Three reported that they had had four years of experience with no opportunities for counseling with their people. This is a phenomenon in and of itself. This may be explained in many ways:

At least one student (and probably several others who did not say so) revealed that he did not have any such experiences because his people were all respectable people, and none of them were "eccentric, strange, or unusual in any sense." This reflects that he perceives counseling in a psychiatric framework and that counseling is aimed only for people who are mentally disturbed in an abnormal way.

Then, too, the student who has been a pastor and had no such opportunities at all may have been so young that he would not be aware of people's deeper troubles. On the other hand, the student's people might not perceive him as the person to whom they would tell their deeper difficulties.

Again, we must remember that these are *student* pastoral situations. The students do not stay in any one place long enough to take root very deeply. This kind of rootage is necessary to an effective counseling ministry.

Finally, pastoral realism teaches us that students are *part-time* pastors. Their visits to their church fields are hurried and filled with the more formal functions of leading public services. Their opportunities for counseling are quite limited and their relationships to their people are frustrated in their growth by the absence of the pastor from the field during the week.

However, of the 75 students, 45 prepared careful reports of their experiences in counseling. Twenty-eight of these 45 students were working in a pastoral setting and 17 were working in non-pastoral settings. These two groups will be discussed separately as follows:

The Pastoral Group. As I have said, 28 men reported in this group. They had an average of 4.47 years of pastoral experience, almost invariably in student pastorates. Most of the work was done in small-town or rural settings. This latter fact is reflected in the type of places in which they had to meet and counsel with the persons whom they interviewed:

Only four of the 28 cases were dealt with in an "office or study" where the pastor would have privacy.

Fifteen of the situations were dealt with on a home-visit basis, reflecting that a good deal of what we have called counseling is not applicable to the student pastorate in that the pastor has to take a measure of initiative in going to see the parishioner rather than wait for the parishioner to seek the help of the pastor by coming to see him.

Six of the counseling situations were dealt with in very casual contacts "while standing in the church yard," "on chance meetings in the neighborhood," "at the general store," or "while sitting in my car," or "on a trip we took together." This bears out something that we learned from Hiltner's book, *The Counselor in Counseling,* that the privacy of a crowd of people or an automobile or a trip taken together is about as much as many pastors can get with their people. However, such situations, if carefully managed, can be the ground of much help rendered to people. Highly formal office surroundings are not nearly as important as effective and secure interpersonal relationships with the persons with whom we counsel.

Two of the 28 counseling situations took place in institutional visits, such as a jail visit and a hospital visit. This reflects something of a dearth of institutional contact for students and rural pastors as compared with the higher incidence of pastoral work done on home visits. City pastoral reports might be different here.

The types of problems presented to these 28 pastors varied widely. Sixteen of the 28 problems were in the specific sphere of marriage and family conflicts. (One of these sixteen was of religious doubts and confusion associated with marital conflicts over religious loyalties; another was a religious conflict arising out of marital infidelity.) Five of the 28 cases were over specifically religious concerns and church administration affairs. For instance, two of the five were complaints over "having lost the as-

surance of salvation," and one of the five was the case of a young convert who had become mentally sick shortly afterward, and the other two of the five were cases of deacons who had become alienated from the pastor over differences of opinion about the management of the church.

In the remaining seven of the 28 cases were one case of acute mental illness wherein the pastor helped in the hospitalization procedures; one case of a criminal in prison, and three cases of acute alcoholism.

The attitudes of the students in these counseling situations need to be noted here. The most common one was a feeling of inadequacy and the need to have some "expert" or "authority" to give him the security of a specific set of rules to follow in the event he should meet this problem again.

Yet, in spite of this sense of inadequacy, the students moved in on most of the problems with a remarkable degree of courage and plain "horse sense." They did not have the disadvantage of thinking that someone was checking on their every move, and this lent naturalness, if not adroitness, to what they did. Blunders quite often were absorbed in the relationship of sincerity and honesty of motive that the counselee sensed in the student.

However, students were more often than not "action centered" and felt so strongly that they had to do something, just anything, that they often "tried to make the counselee see, do, say, or think this, that or the other." Coercive procedures often took the place of sweet reasonableness, listening, and the careful development of a secure friendship with the person as means of indirectly removing the cause of the person's problem, i.e., his isolation, loneliness, feelings of being misunderstood, and deep yearning for a confidant who would not tell all he knew.

But, refreshingly enough, the students usually had the good sense to do nothing when the going was roughest. One student put it this way: "I did nothing and said nothing, because mainly I did not know what to do or say. We just groped along together, but I felt we really understood each other." Actually he had done a great deal: He had developed a secure relationship of understanding, which is the seed-bed of insight, wisdom, and the revelation of a clear path of action. When the path is seen this way, it is likely to be directly from God, and the person will be more likely to be able to walk in it.

The Non-pastoral Group. There were 17 people in the group who reported counseling situations, but who also reported that they did not work as pastors but in some other role.

The counseling of these persons was usually in the role of friend-to-friend relationships. They were non-professional relationships in the main, filled with a sense of mutuality, comradeship, and personal affection one for the other—roommates, classmates, persons who lived at the same boarding house during summer field work, fellow-travelers on public transporta-

tion, etc. The most formal situation in the lot was that of a student who reported his experience as an army officer in dealing with a suicidal man under his command. Another person presented a student counseling situation in which a person came to him out of a class which he was teaching in a local school.

The types of problems, however, which were presented to these students, even though in very informal situations, were no less serious than those problems which come to the attention of the most professional person. In the 17 cases, there were two cases of attempted suicide, two cases of acute mental illness, two premarital pregnancy situations, one ex-convict in need of rehabilitation, four problems of persons in the crisis of choosing religious work as a full-time vocation, one case of a pastor who was in conflict with his whole church and seeking guidance from the student (a resident in his home during the summer), two courtship-engagement conflicts, and three bereavement situations. The wide variety of problems which came to these "friends of friends" affirms the fact that a good deal of counseling is carried on quite unconsciously, without ever being identified as such, and that it is usually in the context of informal friendship. The left hand does not know what the right hand is doing.

The outstanding attitudinal characteristic of this group of non-pastoral counselors was the rugged "give and take" between counselor and counselee. These deeper relationships of long-term friendships permitted a good deal of frankness that more fragile, professional relationships can never take. To compare these counseling situations with professional counseling is like comparing plants that have grown long under natural conditions to those grown quickly under "hot-house" conditions. The latter are not nearly so rugged and hardy.

In these situations everybody seemed to say what he thought as it came to him! Little attention was given to the conditions of time and place. The interviews lasted from 15 minutes in length to all day! They usually happened in the open, with many people around, and with no evidence of planning, management, structuring, or any such thing.

This same sort of analytical study of the counseling experience of more seasoned pastors of differing kinds of pastorates needs to be made. Students in theological seminaries ask different kinds of questions from those asked by pastors in pastors' conferences. They are quite anxious about how to get people to come to them with their problems. They live under a fear of being rejected by their people to such an extent that they will not confide in them. However, the seasoned pastor does not ask how he can get people to come to him. He asks how he can find the time to deal with the heavy demands made upon him for personal counseling, and what resources there are to help him in his efforts to become more proficient in counseling.

PSYCHOTHERAPY AND THE PRISON CHAPLAIN

MELVIN S. HELLER, M.D.

Staff Psychiatrist, United States Penitentiary, Terre Haute, Indiana

The subject of the role of the prison chaplain as it relates to the treatment of emotional problems of penitentiary inmates is a broad one, about which much could be said; in this paper I shall limit my treatment to those practical problems which are familiar to all of us in this work, discussing them, as much as possible, in non-technical language.

The problem of lay therapy is a much-discussed and complex one. I do not intend to enter into that controversy per se, except as it deals with our local institutional problems.

Perhaps we might first say a few things about psychotherapy in general to remind us of common concepts and to promote a wider understanding. Much of what I present will be oversimplified, and even dogmatic, but, because of the varied backgrounds of our readers a few fundamental statements would appear to be in order.

There seems to be a certain amount of confusion as to what psychotherapy actually is, and what it is not. For the purposes of this paper I should like to think of psychotherapy as a series of purposeful communications based upon a structured and understandable, interpersonal relationship between patient and therapist. This perhaps throws some light on a basic difference between psychotherapy and education. Psychotherapy is not primarily a matter of instruction, and education is not characterized by the interpersonal relationship so important in the understanding of what actually happens in psychotherapy. Both processes, however—psychotherapy and education—are learning experiences.

From our definition, there are many forms of psychotherapy. They can be roughly divided into supportive measures, measures aimed at insight, and combinations of the two. There are times when support is indicated, and insight is unacceptable or premature. There are times when forms of psychotherapy based on suggestion—or the personality or position of the therapist—can bring as good results in at least the temporary relief of

---

By request, from an extemporaneous talk given at the *Federal Prison Chaplain's CONFERENCE*, Terre Haute, Indiana, April 28 to May 1, 1953. A.M. Session—"The Chaplain's Contribution to Personality Adjustment"—April 29, 1953.

symptoms in certain cases as can other kinds of therapy which seek to bring the patient an understanding of the underlying neurotic causes of his misery. One would recommend analytically oriented types of psychotherapy because they seek to understand the pathogenic and therapeutic processes themselves and not because of any exclusive claims that might be made for them as a therapy per se. Obviously there are many medicines, and many ways of attempting to heal. Certainly one must admit that for many individuals analysis or analytic types of therapy are simply not available, are impractical, or non-workable. This is obviously true, under present conditions, for many inmates in our population who, nevertheless, are severely disturbed emotionally and require treatment.

Continuing our remarks on psychotherapy in general, it would perhaps be appropriate to say a few things about the kinds of relationships which we find to be so significant in therapy. Almost always, in a prolonged relationship between doctor and patient, or therapist and inmate, certain phenomena of a particularly remarkable nature can be observed. These phenomena have to do with certain neurotic, or unreasonable, attitudes that the patient begins to develop toward the person of the therapist. It is as though the patient comes to confuse the person of the therapist with that of people who played particularly important roles in his or her childhood. Usually these are parental figures, but they may involve anyone who had had a meaningful relationship with the patient in the past; and it is as though the patient "transfers" his previous attitudes and feelings toward these important people onto the therapist himself. Such a "transference," as it is called, is recognized by the irrational and inappropriate attitudes and emotions which the patient reveals in his newly forming relationship with the therapist. Such phenomena must be looked for by the therapist, and recognized for what they are. It is largely such transference phenomena that are responsible for the patient's extreme outbursts of adoration or antipathy toward the therapist. To ignore, or fail to understand, this is to put oneself at a considerable disadvantage in dealing with emotionally disturbed inmates. I should like to proceed to one or two other points before returning to the above remarks.

Volumes have been, and still can be, written about the psychopathology of penitentiary inmates. I think that all of us have been impressed in our penitentiary experience with the particular type of delinquent whom some call psychopathic, others antisocial, others "agitators and troublemakers," or who might be known to you by a host of even less attractive names. I am thinking particularly of the young inmate who might be twenty-one or twenty-two years of age, who has probably stolen a car, who is probably serving his second or even third sentence, with a long history of delinquency, who has a dishonorable discharge from the armed forces, or who might not have served at all, whose father is probably an alcoholic and whose mother might also have been delinquent, who came from an obviously unstable and unhappy home—and who glares at us through the bars as though he had

no friend in the world at all. He is probably of average or above-average intelligence, knows the difference between right and wrong, has been told all the things that we could possibly say to him in terms of instruction, who has been given all the "advice" that we could think to give him now, and who nevertheless remains irresponsible, impulsive, embittered, antisocial, and unapproachable.

What makes a man like this? There are obviously many things that go into the making of such a person, stretching back over the years, for we know he was not born that way. With whom is this inmate at war, and for what does he fight? When all is said and done, I submit that this individual is sick primarily over the kinds of relationships he has had with "papa"—parental figures, and authorities all down the line. Of course I am guilty of oversimplifying the matter, but I cannot emphasize too strongly that in my experience at this penitentiary, and in the discussions that I have had with others working with these same problems, that the most impressive single factor is that these inmates have come to a point where—in plain English—they no longer love and respect their fathers, or any other "fathers" —with all that that implies. And that implies a great deal, much more than one might think on superficial examination of the situation.

It has been stated by some that many of these individuals are normal products of an abnormal background. We see that in operation before our very eyes. Many of our young inmates are already fathers of one or two children themselves. We can see that it takes one to make one—not that it is inherited—but in that we can recognize the continuation of results of parental deficiency from generation to generation. If we ask why these individuals do not respect their fathers, we must conclude that a certain proportion of these fathers are "just plain" not respectable, in a very realistic kind of way. When an inmate doesn't "give a damn," when he has no real set of moral and ethical values, when he does not feel that he has any social responsibility, either toward his own family or toward his community in general, we can guess correctly that in case after case he is "father sick," if you will. He did not have, from the viewpoint of his own emotional needs (I am not speaking of things that money *can* buy), a good father.

It is difficult to see how an inmate can have any real religious feelings if, where there should have been a firm, dependable, and understanding father, there was a neurotic, unstable, or even brutal, alcoholic. It is not by accident that we call our Creator, in languages all over the world, "Lord, our *Father.*" One's feelings about father and Father (or God) are significantly related. It would seem that an understanding of this emotional relationship would be vital to anyone who would attempt to bring religious instruction to this kind of inmate.

Now, what about the problem of therapy? In particular, what about the problem of lay therapy? You know there are times when we all take

refuge behind that marvelous little title, "layman." For example, in discussing some religious topic with our chaplain at lunch I might turn to him and say, "Of course, I'm just a layman, but . . . " A few minutes later he might turn to me and say, "Doc, of course I'm a layman, but don't you think . . . " I suspect this kind of thing is done more frequently than one would realize. Actually, here in prison, I think we are kidding only ourselves. The answer to the problem of lay psychotherapy in a penitentiary setting, under present conditions and in view of our limited facilities—and I am speaking only of this specific penitentiary situation—has much to do with the further question, "If we don't, who will?" I believe that every penitentiary staff member who has directly to do with inmates is a therapist, whether he likes it or not. He may be either therapeutic or antitherapeutic, depending upon his ability to understand his own role and the problems and personalities of the inmates with whom he deals. This is true for the custodial officer, for the shop foreman, for the vocational instructor, and most certainly for the chaplain. Indeed, the prison chaplain is in a particularly challenging and responsible position to establish therapeutic relationships with inmates. We, in all of our institutions, are understaffed, with little or no sight of re-enforcements or relief in the near future. The problems are many, and difficult. Far better men have scratched their heads over what to do. But if we want to rehabilitate, then all of us must take as active and responsible a role as is thrust upon us by the dire necessity of this prison work.

It is entirely natural for inmates to come to the chaplain seeking help for emotional problems. It is possible for a meaningful emotional relationship to be formed between the clergyman and the inmate, a relationship that can be therapeutic. Remembering what was said about our most difficult kind of adjustment problem in the penitentiary, and how that inmate felt about "papa," are not half of you called "Father" anyway? Does not the challenge and responsibility of this very special meaning of your title, not even counting for the moment everything else that it implies, stare you in the face? Does it not, really, answer for you the question as to whether or not you are "lay" psychotherapists in a penitentiary setting, like it or not?

The responsibility weighs heavily on those who recognize it. I know how often those of you who will try to understand the underlying meanings and influencing factors, in the relationships that you form with inmates, will feel at a loss for lack of specific instruction, for lack of a medical background, or for lack of special training. One must set oneself humbly to the tasks of psychotherapy, recognizing many real deficiencies and inadequacies in one's own personality and background. This kind of understanding of oneself and the humility which the truly scientific share with the truly pious are essential to anyone who would "heal," from the most highly trained surgeon or psychiatrist to anyone who would be a counselor or advisor.

I would urge your increased interest in this way of looking at our com-

mon problems. The role of the clergyman in a penitentiary is far different from that in the parish or in civil life. The tasks involve a concentrated problem-population. The responsibilities involved call for more and more practical, first-hand experience, more reading and studying, and an increased understanding of oneself, and of one's role in the penitentiary.

To talk about the many possible solutions and ideas which might be forthcoming regarding the problems we have mentioned here would take us far beyond the limits of this paper. I would recommend the closest possible cooperation, in conference and consultation, between the medical departments and the chaplains in our federal penal institutions. Finally, and with much left unsaid, I would remind you that I have tried only to point out some of the therapeutic implications of the chaplaincy in a penitentiary setting.

THE PRISON CHAPLAINCY

THE REV. HENRY H. CASSLER

Advisory Chaplain, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio

To penal and correctional personnel it would not be necessary to mention that the chaplain was one of the first professional members of the prison staff. In most institutions, the staff consisted of the warden, medical officer, and the chaplain. It is well known that the chaplains were the first educators, librarians, social service workers, physical educators, and on through the list of professions who brought mental, physical, and moral instruction to men committed by the courts. Even though the chaplain has been on the prison staff since the "beginning of time," there is still considerable misunderstanding in connection with his duties and responsibilities. As Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons says:

> The chaplain's position is not often very clearly understood by other personnel. In the first place, the work of the chaplain is not subject to the kind of precise delimitations which can be placed on other types of positions. And secondly, the chaplain does have a sort of dual position in the institution; he must, of course, identify himself with the institution and work in harmony with its methods and objectives, and at the same time keep his identity with the church.

The general public knows little if anything about the work of the clergymen in the penal institution. What is known is probably learned from the last paragraph of what may be a long sensational resumé of a murder—the trial, the appeals, the description of the last meal of the condemned man, and then the slow walk to the gallows. Usually the last sentence is, "Chaplain John Doe walked with the condemned man." It it generally understood that the chaplain has something to do with the Sunday religious services also.

Until just recently there was no such thing as a "trained" prison chaplain. Penal authorities liked to have the chaplain around, but usually they wanted to do their own training so that he would fit in perfectly with their own thoughts on the management of the penal institution. It was not until 1937, when the Federal Bureau of Prisons demanded of the National

---

A paper delivered at the 1953 Annual Meeting of the Church Conference of Social Work at Cleveland, Ohio, May 31-June 5, 1953.

Council of Churches that they supply trained prison chaplains or else the Bureau of Prisons would close its institutions to religious work, that a real effort was put forth to train men for this special field of the Christian ministry. At the present time the National Council of Churches is the clearing house for appointments of federal prison chaplains. Unless a candidate has had at least one year of supervised clinical training there is little likelihood of his receiving a recommendation for appointment from the Department of Pastoral Services of the National Council of Churches.

We must remember that the penal chaplain is not the "typical" pastor of an "average" congregation, neither is he a missionary in a foreign field. A sampling of the religious histories of inmates will very quickly prove that they are not greatly different, as far as religious activities are concerned, from any cross section of American life. Religious statistics on inmates, dealing with church membership, Sunday School attendance, baptism, confirmation, etc., are almost identical with those taken on a national scale.

The chaplain is only pinch hitting for the home pastor and denomination. He does not have an established church. Remember, almost as many persons are graduated from our colleges and universities each year as are released from penal institutions. Someone has said, "They all come out," and this is almost correct. The chaplain strives to strengthen the inmates' personal religious beliefs and practices. He doesn't attempt to convert to any particular denomination. The chaplain cultivates the ground and/or prepares it for the harvest by the organized church in the community.

All chaplaincy service calls for men who are willing to specialize in an interdenominational field. The chaplain must be well trained in his own denomination, but then he must be able to see the entire field of denominationalism in an objective manner or else he should not be in the chaplaincy in a public institution. He must have an understanding of the dynamics of human personality. He must be willing to work harmoniously with the other professions attempting to rehabilitate the inmate.

In the penal institution the chaplain is a department head and thus on an equal level with all other department heads in the institution. His ideas, recommendations, and suggestions stand second to none, but are on an equal with those of his fellow professional workers. He is an active member of the classification committee. According to Federal Civil Service:

> The classification committee is composed of personnel whose special training enables them to evaluate the background, capacities, and current motivations of incoming inmates, and, upon such evaluation, to prepare programs that will be most helpful in the rehabilitation of inmates as well as in adjustment to institutional life. The chaplain is responsible for analyzing the religious background of the inmate and applying this information in making recommendations and suggestions for the inmate's program during his stay in the institution.

The chaplains in our penal institutions have conducted themselves in such a manner that they are appointed to many committees by the warden. The warden makes sure that he does not call upon the chaplain for anything that would in any way be a detriment to the religious program yet he includes the chaplain in any discussions which deal with the over-all program of the institution. Assignments and activities very often depend upon the chaplain's personality, his ability and desires.

Each chaplain, of course, conducts his religious program on an inter-denominational level. The Sunday worship services are conducted with dignity and reverence. Very few chaplains are privileged to hold services in a regular chapel, but must convert auditoriums and the like into places of worship on Sunday morning. The typical robed choir and organ music is not uncommon in these surroundings. The usual Sunday School work is not stressed but emphasis is placed upon group therapy and individual counseling. Subjects that would be "taught" in the typical Sunday School are handled in a group therapy session led by the Chaplain. "Teaching" too often would include doctrine and theology that would turn discussions into arguments between men of different denominational backgrounds. The therapy approach gives the men an opportunity to "think together" on subjects universally connected with self-improvement. In all such group discussions, the chaplain sees to it that such subjects as hostility, aggression, frustration, hatred, acceptance, and the like are dealt with on a realistic plane.

The chaplain in the penal institution is in a unique position when it comes to intensive therapy. There exists among inmates of penal institutions a very strong bond of identification with each other. What is done for one inmate in a particular living quarter is usually accepted as being done for all. Such group inter-reaction can work very favorably for the chaplain. When an inmate who has been in the institution for a length of time comes to the chaplain for counseling it may be understood that rapport, as far as the inmate is concerned, is pretty well established. The trained chaplain, because of his experience with typical inmate responses can take many short-cuts in the approved counseling methods. In most modern penal institutions the inmates are classified according to age, criminal background, seriousness of offense, etc. Naturally there are many other things that a chaplain must take in consideration in his counseling but there are so many things that are "typical" that the chaplain can move much more rapidly in his counseling than can the ordinary pastor. On the other hand, the chaplain in the penal institution is handicapped in his personal counseling in that he cannot fall back on a source of thorough research. There has never been such a project. Almost without exception, those who are considered as authorities on religious counseling will say that the least likely place for this counseling to bear fruit is in the penal atmosphere. Nevertheless, our experienced chaplains do not always agree, for they have seen the "fruits of their labors."

At one time the chaplains in penal institutions were interested almost entirely in seeing that education, trade training, decent food, recreation, medical services, and release were provided for all inmates. They felt that if these things were handled properly the inmate could not help but be rehabilitated. Since all of these "necessities of life" have now been added to our prison program, we have discovered that, unless a real change of heart or an acceptance of the basic principles of religion go hand and hand with these programs, the programs themselves will fail. A man may be taught to be the best machinist in the world, but if he still has an uncontrollable desire to steal tools from the man working on the lathe next to him, his training in the penal institution has been to no avail.

The chaplain would be a hindrance in a penal institution if he assumed the role of the protective, kind, sympathetic mother while the remaining members of the staff assume the role of the stern, disciplinary father. The chaplain is not on the staff to satisfy and console, but he is there to see that the institutional program is carried out under Christian principles. He is not on the staff to "wet nurse" the inmates but to teach them to do things for themselves in an approved manner.

The prison chaplaincy, even though it is one of the oldest professions in the penal field, is just now beginning to mature. Chaplains are only now beginning to shake themselves loose from the many non-religious activities accepted by them, in many cases, for want of something better to do. There are still too many chaplains in certain penal institutions who "preach the word" on Sunday and throughout the week do anything and everything to busy themselves within the institution.

There are many prison chaplains, but few are especially trained for their work. There are many prison systems begging for trained chaplains for their staffs, but the churches are unable to supply the need. The newer prison systems want trained chaplains and they need trained chaplains. It is now the duty of the church to train men for this specific need on an interdenominational basis.

COMMUNICATIONS

Donald Lawder, Jr., Director of Information Services of The Menninger Foundation, on May 14, 1954, issued a statement prepared and approved by participants in the Edward F. Gallahue Planning Conference in Psychiatry and Religion held at The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kansas, on May 13 and 14, as follows:

A conference on religion and psychiatry was held in Topeka, Kansas, May 13 and 14, 1954, under the auspices of The Menninger Foundation and sponsored by Mr. Edward F. Gallahue of Indianapolis. The list of participants is attached. Doctor Karl Menninger presided at the meeting. The psychiatrists and clergymen participating met to further their understanding of each other's beliefs and work, and to clarify ways in which they might collaborate more effectively in relieving mental suffering.

They met on the common ground that there is nothing incompatible between the principles of religion and those of psychiatry, and that a man's relationship to God, no less than his relationships to other men and to the world, is relevant in both psychiatry and in the ministry of religion.

Psychiatrists attending the conference indicated that their daily work with patients requires understanding of the importance of religious experience and the teachings of religion. For their part, the clergymen attending indicated that their understanding of people is enhanced by the insights of psychology and psychiatry.

Certain misrepresentations which have been made about both psychiatry and religion were discussed and deplored. For example, some clergymen have charged all psychiatry with being materialistic and with placing excessive emphasis on sex. Some psychiatrists have considered all religion a manifestation of neurosis. Such distortions have prevented some members of each group from adequately appreciating the work of the other and have served to confuse the public.

The psychiatrists and clergymen participating agreed that they are at work on many common problems and that their spheres of function are mutually involved in many respects. The sharp separation between facts and value judgments is artificial and prevents the realization that the rich insights gained through both religion and psychiatry are basically complementary. The participants recognized that areas of disagreement remain and will remain until further understanding leads to integration.

They felt that further collaboration would be profitable and resolved to continue to further the aims of the conference in their professional work.

The conference endorsed existing efforts to promote the instruction of medical students and psychiatric residents about the principles of religion and the work of clergymen, and the instruction of theological students about the principles of psychiatry and the work of psychiatrists. The members urged

the extension of such mutual education both through formal training programs and future conferences at local and national levels. They agreed to report to each other within two months their comments and evaluation of the meeting. These comments and additional papers to be submitted during the course of the year will be used in planning a similar conference to be held at the Menninger Foundation next year.

Visiting theological and clergy representatives were: Father John R. Connery, S.J., Professor of Moral Theology, West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Indiana; Dr. Perry Epler Gresham, President of Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia; for ten years a professor of philosophy, former pastor of Central Woodward Christian Church in Detroit, representative of the Disciples of Christ to the World Council of Churches and to the Conference on Faith and Order at Lund, Sweden; Professor Seward Hiltner, Acting Dean, Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago, first Executive Secretary of the Department of Pastoral Services, National Council of Churches, author of *Sex Ethics and the Kinsey Report, Self Understanding, The Counselor in Counseling, Pastoral Counseling, Religion and Health,* etc.; Father Gerald Kelly, S.J., Professor of Moral Theology, St. Mary's College, St. Marys Kansas; author of the *Medico-Moral Problems* series of the Catholic Hospital Association, etc.; the Reverend Arnold H. Lowe, Pastor, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota, author of *Power for Life's Living, When God Moves In, Start Where You Are, The Importance of Being Ourselves,* etc.; Rabbi Samuel S. Mayerberg, Temple B'nai Jehudah, Kansas City, Missouri, lecturer in religion at University of Kansas, author of *Chronicle of an American Crusader,* etc.; Dean James A. Pike, New York Cathedral, New York, author of *Beyond Anxiety, The Faith of the Church.* etc.; and Father Dunstan Wack, Professor of Psychology, St. Benedicts College, Atchison, Kansas, author of *Psychological Study of Conscience.*

Local theological and clergy representatives were: the Reverend Orlo F. Choguill, First Presbyterian Church; Dean John W. Day, Grace Cathedral; the Reverend Eugene Frank, First Methodist Church; Chaplain Herbert P. Fritze, VA Hospital; Chaplain Charles V. Gerkin, Boys Industrial School; Reverend Don Jones, Methodist Church, Rossville, and The Menninger Foundation; Chaplain Thomas Klink, Topeka State Hospital; and Chaplain Robert A. Preston, VA Hospital.

Visiting psychiatric representatives were: Sol Ginsburg, M.D., Psychoanalyst and Psychiatrist, New York City, former Chairman of Committee on Social Issues, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, New York School of Social Work; Frederick Hacker, M.D., Psychoanalyst and Chief of Staff, Hacker Psychiatric Clinic and Hacker Foundation, Los Angeles, California; Ian Stevenson, M.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Louisiana State University School of Medicine, New Orleans; author of numerous articles on psychiatry and religion and psychosomatic medicine, including "Why People Change," in *Harper's,* December, 1953.

Local psychiatric representatives were: Alfred Bay, M.D., Superintendent Topeka State Hospital; Otto Fleischmann, Ph.D., Director, Department of

Psychoanalytic Training, The Menninger Foundation; D. Bernard Foster, M.D., Director, Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery, The Menninger Foundation; Bernard H. Hall, M.D., Education Department, The Menninger Foundation; Cotter Hirschberg, M.D., Director, Department of Child Psychiatry, The Menninger Foundation; Frank F. Merker, M.D., Section Chief, Winter VA Hospital; Gardner Murphy, Ph.D., Director, Research Department, The Menninger Foundation; and Karl Menninger, M.D.

Representing the Sponsor, Mr. Gallahue, was Edward Gallagher, Executive Vice President, American States Insurance Company, Indianapolis, Indiana.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Edited by The Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks

Man's Need and God's Action: Reuel L. Howe; Seabury Press, Greenwich, Conn., 1953. 159 pp. $2.50.

The perennial blight which makes the Church so tasteless to multitudes is the separation of its symbols and rites from the ground of human experience. Becoming mere decorative appliques, their repetition becomes inane and boring. Their sanctity appears most irrelevant and everything done in and by the Church seems to a humanly real person as remote, far-off and fundamentally superfluous, if not dishonest.

It is at this juncture where life and symbolic things and actions impinge on one another that Professor Howe makes his significant contribution. That the perspective is established within the sacramental system of the Episcopal Church does not affect in the slightest degree the cogency of his observations and the helpfulness of his insights for the clergy or laity of any of the Protestant Churches. Here one can see, as in a transparent model, the dynamics involved in the old, old sacraments and forms of the Christian Church, which to many have become very opaque indeed.

Not only is this book an accurate and thoughtful correlation of psychological insight and theological tradition; it has the superior advantage of being patiently expressed in the kind of careful simplicity that makes it extremely valuable for persons, lay or clerical, who are not oriented to the full professional jargon either of theology or of psychotherapy. For instance, those who find such a work as Tillich's *Courage To Be* too much for them, will find here the same essential patterns of dynamic experience and their cultic parallels made plain.

The whole structure of personal being, with its need of love and forgiveness, is humbly explored in the light of the depth of human need to which God ministers. Facing the existential ground of loneliness and alienation, Dr. Howe traces the mediating channels of parental love and the larger fellowship of the Holy Community as they serve the individual and his growing and changing needs. This is done with excellent thoroughness especially in regard to sin, and the atoning act of grace by which the deadlock of hopelessness is broken. The drama of redemption becomes an exciting marshalling of the powers of being, released by God's initiative and forgiveness, made visible, educative and concrete in the corporate acts of the living Church.

If there are people who have lost the path which binds ordinary life in its changing vicissitudes to the changeless structure of ecclesiastical tradition, this book is a competent and loving guide. God will be found in these pages, not far off, a dream vaguely remembered or an ideal distantly elusive, but near at hand, a neighbor in the vicinity of one's deepest and most urgent needs.

Surely such an experience would restore the Church to its true stature as the center of a vigorous and eternal dynamic supporting and fulfilling man's high destiny.

SAMUEL H. MILLER

■

Psychology and Pastoral Practice: W. L. Northridge; Pastoral Psychology Book Club, Great Neck, New York, 1953. 160 pp. No price indicated.

This is a well-written, easily read little volume originally published by the Epworth Press in London, and presumably is a good indication of the pastoral practice and understanding in the current English scene.

It deals with many of the areas of pastoral problems that are of specific concern to the conscientious minister. It points up graphically the repressive quality of much revival influence in so-called conversion experience. It makes a determined attempt to understand the experiences of the adolescent with a due recognition of the emotional factors involved. It deals with the problems of unconscious guilt and makes clear-cut and valid distinctions that should be of real help to the average pastor. There is also some helpful material on a distinction between sin and symptoms, though one would wish that the author had said more about this.

There is also in the volume a clear-cut awareness of the fact that many of the problems people bring to their pastors, often thought of as intellectual problems or moral problems, are really much more the kinds of problems that need to be understood as expressions of a sick person. A good illustration of this was found in the material dealing with alcoholism. Again, there is a good introduction to the qualities that make a good pastor, and, throughout the volume, one gets the feeling of the author's being a very friendly and accepting sort of person, the kind of individual one would hope to be able to find if one is confronted with difficulties in living.

There is much, however, about this volume that would make a clinically trained pastor quite uncomfortable. The author has a tendency to treat this involved and most complex, as well as dangerous, field of human living in much too facile a way. He seems to encourage over and over again the untrained pastor to attempt far too much, even to the point of probing into unconscious material in order to "get at" the problems. There seems to be no awareness, and certainly no indication of urging, on the part of the author, that an indispensable *sine qua non* of the pastor's training, if he is to counsel with deeply disturbed people, must be clinical experience. This is perhaps the greatest basic criticism of this volume. The author has a tendency to marked oversimplification as, for example, when on page 92 he implies that all one has to do for an inferiority complex is to join the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve Force; or again, on page 155, when talking about visiting in the home of the mother who has had three of her children hospitalized for mental illness, the author says that he had a talk with her along the lines of God's love and suggestions for peace, confidence, and health to replace those of fear and resentment and despair, and "this has made a considerable difference to the home atmosphere, and there are no signs of further trouble."

The author's psychological understandings seem to be very dated. For example, he specifically advocates the point of view that all that is necessary in difficulties in living is to locate a specific trauma and, having gotten the patient to ventilate about this, it all clears up. He also states quite specifically that no psychotherapy is possible with the mentally ill. This would, of course, overlook completely the great work done by Dr. Freida Fromm-Reichmann in the United States. Equally, there is to be found a rather strict acceptance of conservative Freudian doctrine with apparently no awareness that much of this doctrine has been changed by some of Freud's successors.

There seems to be a complete lack of awareness of the tremendous developments in the American scene. Only two American authors are mentioned, and the one that is mentioned more than once, The Rev. John Rathbone Oliver, M.D., of Baltimore, is certainly by no means a modern thinker in this field. Nothing is said of the work of Harry Stack Sullivan and the interpersonal theory of psychiatry, or Erich Fromm, Karen Horney, or even Adolph Meyer in the field of psychobiology. The author also indicates no knowledge of Ian Suttie's tremendous contributions in *The Origins of Love and Hate.*

The book, therefore, is definitely disappointing. Although led to expect good clinical material, there is no evidence of how the pastor works as a pastor or any discussion of the pastor-parishioner relationship. Any clergyman concerned about his pastoral role and looking to the experts in this field for guidance has the right to expect much more than is to be found in this book.

ERNEST E. BRUDER

•

Toward Spiritual Security: Wesner Fallaw; The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1952. 192 pp. $3.00.

Dr. Fallaw, like many others, is greatly concerned about the state of the world and the condition of the Church: People are no longer secure; nor will they be secure until they find *spiritual* security which apparently is achieved by means of "proper group relations." The author believes that "a person can be secure only to the degree that he enjoys whole (wholesome) relations with his fellows, and, accordingly grows into the maturity of a spiritual personality."

Spiritual security can be brought about by "fostering groupness" in the neighborhood. In particular, Dr. Fallaw hopes that the Church may become a "body of primary groups," composed of "like-minded people" for the purpose of "fellowship." Thus will come the "communion of saints."

There are also minor themes, possibly more disparate than integrated. For instance, one chapter is on "The Family: Where Security Begins." Another deals with "Work with Individuals." And in his chapter on "The Churches from a Community Perspective," the author makes a strong case for ecumenicity at the local level.

There is a confusion in this presentation, however, which should be challenged. First of all, the author not only fails to distinguish between "security"

and "maturity," but frequently he actually seems to equate them by using them interchangeably. It is never clear as to which of these two terms he really has in mind.

In our culture, "immaturity" has become almost an epithet, and "maturity" frequently implies compatibility. Nevertheless the word does have a legitimate meaning, despite the way it has been exploited. St. Paul provides such when he wrote "Not that I have already obtained this or am already perfect; but I press on . . .Let those of us who are mature be thus minded . . ." (Phil. 3:12, 15). In this sense the concept is a dynamic one, with the emphasis upon growing and becoming. Growing always involves anxiety, and one measure of the extent of growth (or the *degree* of maturity) is the amount of anxiety that one can handle.

Security, on the other hand, is the anti-anxiety factor in life. To be sure an adequate amount of *that* is needed too! We need sufficient security to sustain growth, but not so much as to smother it. Growth, rather than security, is the purpose of life.

Dr. Fallaw (who is Howard Professor of Religious Education at Andover Newton Theological School) is quite correct in assuming that "groupness" *does* make for a feeling of security, and it is even possible that this groupness may have a "spiritual" quality about it. Moreover, the idea of the value of greater group participation in churches and neighborhoods seems valid to this reviewer. (What is good therapy in hospitals may be good prevention in outside communities.) But one hesitates to accept "groupness" as an end in itself, and more especially when it is so nearly equated with the "communion of the saints."

In true communion—with others and the Other—the individual *finds* himself; in mere groupness he is lost to himself, and eventually even to others. Forcing fellowship—or, worse still, assuming that fellowship exists because hostile feelings are repressed—is to deny the possibility of true communion. For true communion is the result of adequate *communication,* and communication involves working through feelings about one another. This process is too threatening for many; and the very idea that this necessity confronts them arouses so much anxiety to the "church," generally speaking, that the problem is either denied or not seen.

The author believes that souls are saved by "fostering groupness" among "like-minded people." Thus they become "secure," and achieve their principal present cultural longing. But at what price? Do they pay for this security with the coin of their potential for becoming mature? How then are they to manage—and not merely run away from—the necessary anxieties of life? It is because such questions are not even anticipated that this book is disappointing and—at points—even misleading.

ARCHIBALD F. WARD, JR.

•

I Take Thee: Charles H. Douglass; published by the author, 231 Haverhill Drive, San Antonio 1, Texas, 1953. 36 pp. 75 cents.

The sub-title of this little, paper-bound book, "A Pastoral Theology of Christian Marriage," accurately describes its content. Although purposely oriented around the Service of Holy Matrimony of *The Book of Common Prayer* and hence Anglican in its theological point of view, the presentation will prove to be of extraordinary value even to those Christians from a non-liturgical background.

The author, in his Preface, describes the book as "a clerical manual to be used as a basis for marriage instruction by priests of the Church. It is not concerned with techniques of instruction but with the substance."

The first two chapters provide one of the best summaries this reviewer has ever seen of the historical background to the evolution of Christian marriage. The chapter on "Grace" is long over-due in premarital instruction. Sentiment so often has replaced doctrine. The author rightly points out that the "vows as have been taken can never be fulfilled by unaided human strength." The sacramental aspect of Christian marriage is set forth clearly and without genuflections. "More is begun than is effected at the moment," Mr. Douglass points out. "It is begun only in the context of the manner in which the participants come to the occasion of God's acting, and it is continued with real effect only if the possibility of its continuance is recognized and encouraged."

Furthermore "The marriage rite is not performed in a vacuum. What has gone before affects it, and what follows serves to bring the couple into a fulfillment, a real filling up, of those things which are implicit in their vows. At every point in the marriage, from their first attraction to each other until their separation by death, each is constantly saying to the other, 'I take thee.' "

The author also provides magnificent treatment of the whole subject of the physical side of marriage. None of the unrealistic fastidiousness of the celibate ascetic obscures the reality situation. "The Christian approaches the physical relation in marriage without fear, but with confidence, without shame, but with anticipation." In fact the author goes even further and states that "During the days of the 'engagement' it is not only a usual occurrence, but a good one, that the two should share an increasing intimacy in their physical contacts. This is again a part of the process of marriage as distinguished from the event. Reading about the physiology of marriage and seeking an adequate physical examination are essential, but not sufficient. A developing knowledge on the part of each party of the body of the other is one of the surest ways to avoid a sudden shock on the honeymoon." The author proceeds to warn, however, that this is "a far cry from advocating premarital intercourse."

Throughout the entire book the author has kept to his original purpose of stressing the "why" and "what" of marriage and has avoided the "how." It is the hope of this reviewer that Mr. Douglass might expand this book, or invite collaboration, to the end that a new book might emerge which would include to some degree "methods" and would be re-oriented for lay consumption. As it is, he has made an exceptionally valuable contribution to the growing literature in the pastoral field.

ROLLIN J. FAIRBANKS

The Soviet Impact on Society: Dagobert D. Runes; Philosophical Library, New York, 1953. 202 pp. $3.75.

Fifteen years ago Professor Runes wrote this amazing book. Because it "appeared too daring in its accusations," no publisher could then be procured. Today it is published, presumably, to authenticate the prophetic insights of the author and to rally the Free World even further for its death struggle with Marxism and the Soviet Union.

Professor Runes marshalls his charges in four parts. The first discredits Marxism as a system; the second devotes thirteen brief chapters to refutation of practically every Soviet claim to social and economic achievement; the third presents interesting and seldom seen data on abortive Communist ventures in Hungary, Bavaria, and Outer Mongolia soon after the Bolshevik revolution of 1917; the fourth summons the democracies to stern action against the Red conspiracy within their borders.

The book provides interesting, even exciting, reading. It reveals an author who foresaw the menace of Marxist Communism and of the Soviet Union long before many were awakened. Certainly he must be credited with foresight and with courage for attempting to proclaim what was then an unpopular interpretation.

The author reveals, unfortunately, a lack of wisdom within which to interpret his courageous foresight. He chooses to produce an impassioned, undocumented pamphlet, not a profound criticism. This method could secure no audience at all in 1938; it will gain him little serious attention in our time. This is deeply unfortunate. We are desperately in need of clear-visioned guides who can help steer us between hysteria and complacency toward Soviet despotism. The struggle is far too serious and critical to be treated within the limited analysis of this book.

PRENTISS L. PEMBERTON

•

Campus Gods on Trial: Chad Walsh; Macmillan, New York, 1953. 138 pp. $2.50.

In this book Chad Walsh is illustrating forcefully and in an easily comprehensible manner the meaning of the First Commandment, "I am the Lord Thy God; thou shalt have none other gods but me." But, as he points out, there are many strange gods stalking about our colleges these days, and, what is more, they have many followers. Some of these gods are the perennial chestnuts, whose guiles are strong enough to catch only the naive or warped student, such gods as the "fiery furnace" god or the daddy god. Other competing gods are more sophisticated. They use effectively the big lie, which is usually the small truth blown up to inordinate size. These gods include the pragmatic god, the materialistic god, the pseudo-scientific god. Because they speak with some authority to students who are looking for their kind of grace, they have many adherents these days.

But, as Dr. Walsh points out, these other gods thrive more on ignorance

than on malice-ignorance on the part of the student about the nature of the true God. For one reason or another many students have picked up quite fanciful ideas about the Lord of Christianity (the author gives many verbatim illustrations of this) and they spend much of their time taking cracks at their illusions about God, and worshiping the while at the altars of straw gods who, they think, have not made these mistakes.

The latter part of the book is given over to positive reconstruction of the One God, taking into consideration particularly the motives and mistakes of the average student. It is done in an understanding and intelligent vein, for Dr. Walsh has had much to do with students in his years of teaching and in his more recent ministry.

It should be pointed out, however, that this book would not do very well for the more sophisticated students, especially those in certain Eastern private universities. Although some of the titles of chapters are quite imaginative, the book itself is by and large not particularly original. Some of the suggestions, such as the amount of prayer that a student should start in by doing, are rather exorbitant. Fifteen minutes per day is more like an end than a beginning for most students. The book is a bit sentimental in spots and the language is occasionally a trifle condescending. But it is a good book and a very useful book to put in the hands of our many adolescent skeptics now attending college.

FREDERIC B. KELLOGG

•

Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr: Oscar Cullman; Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1953. 252 pp. $4.50.

The history of the Church seems at times the biography of St. Peter writ large. Upon him, who was to deny his Lord in an hour of crisis, Jesus nevertheless founded his Church, not upon a steadfast saint, but upon a believer much like ourselves.

Peter has been traditionally regarded as the Roman Catholic apostle, as Paul was the apostle for the Gentiles and for Protestantism, and James the apostle of Jewish Christianity. Professor Cullman has here demonstrated that Peter is much closer to Paul than to James. It may indeed have been Peter who first perceived the significance of Jesus as the Suffering Servant. Bits of evidence are here pieced together to make possible a Christology of St. Peter even without resorting to the two epistles ascribed to him. Cullman holds as authentic the Matthean tradition of Peter as the rock upon which Jesus built his Church, but insists that this was a personal authority which could be passed on neither to a place (Antioch or Rome) nor to a successor. The author's very careful analysis of liturgical, literary, and archaeological evidence leads to the conclusion that Peter died a martyr in Rome.

The book is divided into two parts: historical and theological. The division between Protestant and Catholic is likened to the ancient division between Gentile and Jewish Christian, each agreeing to respect the other. It is Cullman's view that forthrightness and depth of conviction need not prevent the

extension of a bridge of understanding across the gulf that separates the two communions.

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

•

Protestantism in America: Jerald C. Brauer; Westminster, Philadelphia, 1953. 307 pp. $3.50.

This narrative history of Protestantism in the United States presents a fabric woven of the diverse strands of our various denominations for clothing the mind of lay folk so that they may be decently informed about what lies immediately behind them. The author maintains that there is a discernible unity to Protestantism despite its diversity and he has produced a document which seems to support his claim. Whatever the church membership of the reader may be, he cannot but feel (if he be a Protestant at all) that he is reading about those akin to him on every page, although events in his own church life may be recorded only occasionally.

Dr. Brauer maintains that Protestantism is characterized by "full, free experimentation and an enduring Biblicism," which turns out to mean it arises from a "faith that God has more truth and light yet to break forth from his holy Word." Trusting in this continuing process, Protestantism's life in the U. S. A. has been a varied, often violent, and always exciting business. It leaves the reader a bit breathless to see so much in so small a space, and it made this reviewer wish that he might read the chapter which will follow the last one when, fifty years from now, someone looks back on what we are doing under God in this continuing process.

PHILIP HUMASON STEINMETZ

•

They Built for Eternity: Gustav-Adolph Gedat, translated by Roland H. Bainton; Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York, 1953. 175 pp. $5.00.

Two years ago the author (who was educated both in Germany and in this country and who has engaged in Christian work in many parts of the world during the past thirty years) published this work in Germany under the title *Sie Bauten für die Ewigkeit.* Because of the wide-spread destruction in his native land, this plea for abiding values in history had a wide reception. There are overtones which imply despair with this world and an acceptance of the futility of human effort which will not so widely appeal to the American mind.

The last chapter on the transitoriness of all things human follows more than 150 large quarto pages of interesting narrative, journal, and first-hand experience with the great remaining monuments of the cultures of all ages. These fascinating accounts are nontechnical but accurately descriptive in character and are also highly illustrated, often with full-page pictures.

One might dare to wish for cut lines on the pages where the illustrations appear rather than in an appended index to all pictures at the end of the book. The photographic reproductions lack something of the sharpness which better grade paper would have made possible.

The translation by Professor Roland Bainton of the Yale Divinity School captures all the charm and excitement of the original.

RAYMOND W. ALBRIGHT

•

The Superstitions of the Irreligious: George Hedley; Macmillan, New York, 1951. 40 pp. $2.50.

Dr. Hedley has succeeded in putting into a small volume what the average religionist tries to say over and over again in his everyday experiences, namely, that a great deal of the rather pompous criticisms cast at religion are, under close inspection, sheer superstitions. The author points out that the hallmark of superstition is unwillingness to examine the facts in a given case, and then proceeds to show why certain anti-religious statements are in reality superstitions.

The uncomfortable and rather disheartening aspect of the book, an aspect undoubtedly recognized by the author, is that it probably will be read by the wrong people. The superstitious—whether they be the college student who has just completed his first semester of psychology and is now "enlightened" as to the "illusion" of all religion, or whether they be the intellectual sophisticates who have long ago dismissed religion as "unscientific"—are so bound by their superstition that it is unlikely that they will step outside their dogmatic borders long enough to hear what Dr. Hedley has to say. At any rate, Dr. Hedley's message is lucid and reasonable, a fine refutation of those who fly the flag of non-religious and anti-religious clichés.

ORLO STRUNK, JR.

•

I Live and Move: Dorothy Henderson; Philosophical Library, New York, 1953. 104 pp. $3.00.

It is unusual to find an uncomplicated yet arresting book, which can be helpful to so many people. *I Live and Move* certainly qualifies. Lawyers, sensing a need in a client for counsel more helpful than legal solutions; physicians, reaching beyond medicine to guide a patient into the realm of the spirit, clergy, needful of starting a distraught mind back towards the simplicity of faith and understanding; all—and many more—will find in Dorothy Henderson's series of sketches interpretation of the meaning of life which can help them in their efforts to free men's minds, hearts, and souls.

ELITA DAVENPORT WALLACE

•

With Singleness of Heart: Gerald Kennedy; Harper, New York, 1951. 157 pp. $2.75.

Eight sermons on the ministry, directed to preachers by a Bishop of the Methodist Church. Making no pretense or parade of psychological knowledge, they are packed with astute common-sense observations backed by wide reading. Almost any clergyman will find these chapters to be models of sermon construction. More important, he will be warmed, warned, and inspired by

them to be a better pastor. Here is good material for a minister's morning meditation.

PAUL B. MAVES

•

Recreation for the Aging: Arthur Williams; Association Press, New York, 1953. 192 pp. $3.00.

A handbook, guide, and leadership-training manual which will be indispensable for all those planning, organizing, and administering recreational programs for older people. It does not give directions for specific games and activities but is rich in program suggestions based upon actual procedures in operation across the United States. An extensive bibliography directs the leader to a wealth of resources. There is a special chapter for the church and one for the shut-in, which will be of special interest to ministers. Prepared for the National Recreational Association, this book will be a standard reference in the recreational field.

PAUL B. MAVES

•

The Intimate Problems of Women: Henry B. Stafford, M.D.; Hawthorn Books, New York, 1953. 271 pp. $3.95.

Here is a collection of personalized case histories from the files of an eminent New York gynecologist. The thirty chapters cover a wide range of "female troubles" from vaginal infections to cancer, from menstruation to change of life. The persistent reader and the leisurely one can glean here interesting and helpful information about women and their illnesses, though much of the wisdom is buried in the conversational give-and-take of the recorded interviews.

A parish minister would find this a slow way to discover for himself about women's diseases and complaints, but the book might be loaned, with considerable benefit to all concerned, to some suffering and troubled women. Such persons could gain perspective and understanding of their malady from the reading of pertinent chapters in this book.

ELIZABETH BONNEY BURNS

•

Reflections on Life: Alexis Carrel; Hawthorn Books, New York, 1952. 205 pp. $3.00.

Dr. Carrel's *Man the Unknown* (1935) was a bold plea for a consideration of the whole man as a biological unit, at the expense of preoccupation with one and another of his many parts to which specialists address themselves. The book found many enthusiastic lay readers. Doctors were much less enthusiastic. They felt that in breaking with the conventional medical patterns Dr. Carrel was also breaking caste medically.

This book will have the same reception, to a still greater degree. Laymen will welcome it; professional medical men will deplore it. Dr. Carrel, as we meet him here, is variously a philosopher, ethical teacher, a sociologist, and a

religious believer, as well as a doctor. He deplores the unnaturalness of modern life and its unwarranted confidence in abstract systems imposed upon the facts. He rests his case upon "the fundamental laws of human life" and a return to nature. Three types of phenomena furnish the concrete basis for what should be our fundamental laws: "the conservation of life, the propagation of the race, the development of the mind." The author drafts proposed rules of conduct and then—a much more difficult task—suggests ways of putting them into practice. He finds hope in the fact that for the first time in history ours is a generation which knows it is in decline and therefore at the same time is in a position to correct that decline. Carrel concedes the inability of the isolated individual to do much and stresses our opportunity and indeed our obligation to organize small "cells" for the work reclamation. This is an original, honest, courageous, and suggestive book.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

•

Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation; An Historical Introduction to Anglican Practice: Derrick Sherwin Bailey; Macmillan, New York, 1953. 145 pp. $2.25.

Among the more perplexing and disturbing problems confronting the parish clergymen are those associated with the admission of sponsors at baptism. With all the good will in the world, the eager parents of children about to be christened will select godparents for the most inadequate reasons. "He never goes to church but he is devoted to the baby;" "He is a Jew but he is perfectly willing to make the promises." Perhaps the most amazing variation of this motif known to the reviewer was the offer of a devout, practicing Christian Scientist to be baptized herself in order to qualify as a godmother. Such requests and such offers are made in love; to refuse them is never easy, and to do so all too frequently injects a note of bitter bewilderment into an occasion of joy; and such a procedure will even dim a genuine eagerness for the beginning of a Christian family life.

But such contemporary pastoral problems are no more difficult and in some ways easier than those which the author recounts in his short though exceedingly thorough and able presentation of the rather confusing history of sponsoring at baptism and confirmation. In fact one derives the impression that the origins of the practice are so vague in the early centuries of our era and the perversions of it so great in the Middle Ages, that the Church is free to gather up the useful remaining fragments for a valuable and effective practice of sponsorship today. Indeed, such a book even tempts one to think that discontinuity is as important as continuity in many ecclesiastical customs and that breaking precedents is often as essential as keeping them!

The book is one of a growing number dealing with Christian initiation, a subject of increasing importance both for theologians and parish priests in our ambiguous "post Christian" society. Bailey indicates that this volume owes its origin to a statement of a committee of the 1948 Lambeth Conference—"We think it would be a valuable guide for future practice if research were made into the history of godparents and the function assigned to them in the Church, particularly in early times."

This is exactly what Dr. Bailey does, showing how sponsorship for an adult before his baptism slowly became the post-baptismal training of the child, how parents were commonly the sponsors in earlier times and how their function was gradually taken over by godparents; how the association of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer developed both in connection with the service itself and then with the subsequent training of the child, with the Ten Commandments added at the Reformation.

The author by no means believes that sponsorship is a meaningless survival but feels that a number of changes in its practice are indicated. Parents should, under normal conditions, be not only allowed, but *required* to act as sponsors, with at least one other selected. Sponsors should be communicants and their importance stressed in the baptismal service itself; in fact the service might well begin with a formal commissioning and dedication of sponsors. The number of times that one person might act as sponsor should be limited; "ideally apart from one's own children, a single godchild is a sufficient responsibility for any Christian." Each candidate for confirmation might be presented to the Bishop by a sponsor who has had some share in his preparation. The sponsor should be taught that he is acting as agent and representative of the Church, as both Augustine and Hooker insisted.

All these proposals appear to be sound in themselves and in accord with recent emphasis upon baptism as entrance into a redemptive community relationship, an emphasis indicated by the rapidly growing custom in the Protestant Episcopal Church of performing baptisms at a regular Sunday service in the presence of the congregation.

Among other interesting features of the study, an item both amusing and horrible, is the description of the development of the "cognatio spiritualis" (spiritual affinity) doctrine in the early medieval period under which parents were forbidden to act as sponsors and in which it was asserted that godparents acquired so definite a paternity to their godchildren that marriage between them was forbidden. Later such prohibition was even extended to "spiritual" brothers and sisters! Although this monstrous doctrine was repudiated at the Reformation, parents were not admitted as sponsors in the Anglican Church because it was still felt that others besides them should share in the nurture of the child. Not until 1786 did the Protestant Episcopal Church become the first Anglican body to accept parents as sponsors "if it be desired."

GEORGE W. BARRETT

•

What's Your Problem?: Alfred Blazer; The Citadel Press, New York, 1953. 372 pp. $3.50.

Here is a clear example of the way in which the good may stand in the way of the best. For while the author, a helpful psychiatrist, has taken what would seem to be a large number of actual letters of inquiry addressed to a daily paper, and has given as a feature writer and from the resources of much study and much actual practice, a great deal of sheer information and legitimate advice, he has nonetheless done it from the point of view of what might be called diplomatic naturalism. He has, therefore, little more to offer by way

of purpose and goal than utilitarianism and hedonism.

This point of view comes through sharply when he is discussing sex. He makes a common-sense plea for much more freedom than society will at present allow and misses entirely the empirically proven relationship between chastity in the unmarried and the development of consciousness; and, of course, seeing no need to baptize this drive, in the married or the unmarried, into the Kingdom of God, and to respond as new creatures to the varied and vital day-to-day consequences.

In short, the author has taken his honest stand against the demands and the responsibilities of a life which is becoming increasingly aware of the dimension of religion, and while he advocates tact when asked point blank whether or not a psychiatrist should tamper with a person's religion, he quite obviously believes that a depth analysis would rid the person of these pragmatically useful supports, and just as obviously, even in the midst of suave caution, wishes that the thing could happen; that the religious substitute, the analyzed mind, could be offered to all who need it, and especially to those whom he might consider somewhat fanatical, those who feel that they must bear witness to their religious beliefs.

But apart from the fact that the author does not seem to understand healthy religion and its necessary place in the mature life, he does offer at the humanist level, a level much higher than that on which the world is actually living, many clarifying and encouraging pages. He will take many readers behind the scenes and show them psychosomatic interconnections that they have never thought of before, but which are being clinically proven. He will remove much worry on the part of some as he shows that that which they felt, in their private living, to be abnormal, may be fairly normal. And where problems outlast any insight which the book may bring, he will do much by his explanation of some of the methods of psychotherapy to encourage persons to seek professional help.

In spite of the basic criticism which has been offered, namely, that the implied and expressed philosophy in which the work is set is unnecessarily limited, the pastor will find in this book much that will guide him in his face-to-face contacts with his people. If in no other way, it will help him to understand the thinking and the language of those in the fields of psychology and psychiatry. And if the pastor understands, as he reads the book, just where and why he cannot agree with it, he will be the better grounded as a man of religion.

JOHN DIXON COPP

•

A Sober Faith: G. Aiken Taylor; Macmillan, New York, 1953. 108 pp. $2.00.

The chronic alcoholic has presented a problem to which neither medicine nor the Church has found an adequate answer. One organization, however, in the past eighteen years has had increasing success in its attempts to help chronic alcoholics. This organization is Alcoholics Anonymous, and its history, development, and activities provide the subject matter for this book. The author attempts an analysis of Alcoholics Anonymous and of the methods by which it has actually succeeded in its task. The data for the book are the result

of Dr. Taylor's first-hand experience with members of A.A. and also of his experience as a minister. There are valuable lessons which can be learned from the methods of this unique organization, with which the Church should be acquainted but which have frequently been forgotten. Such a comparison as is made in this book serves to bring back into sharp focus some of the dynamic characteristics of the faith of first-century Christians, in a day when issues and moral standards have become lamentably blurred.

After briefly describing the beginnings of A.A., Dr. Taylor sketches its history in a realistic manner, taking care always not to make claims and generalizations which would be untrue. For example, he faces up to the occurrence of "slips" that occur in the lives of members of the group.

Alcoholics Anonymous, says Dr. Taylor, "tackles its problem by directing its patients to a Power outside themselves," and then he goes on to point out that likewise "Religion whose faith is only the Golden Rule, whose gospel is a demand for moral discipline, whose platform is planked solely with ethical principles, stands powerless to meet the needs of men and women in a chaotic age."

As "the twelve steps" are examined and illustrated, the author draws out their close analogy to the fundamental principles underlying the religious way of life. This latter he succeeds in doing admirably and without trying to push the analogies farther than they will reasonably go. A.A. is no substitute for religion even though functionally it appears to serve the same purpose in so many ways.

Dr. Taylor's analysis of Step Three enables him to look at faith (as the group defines it), and the first point that stands out, he says, is the need for repeated commitment, not a solitary decision. A member does not dare to rely upon his belief in high ideals; he knows that they are powerless to save him. Likewise, Dr. Taylor points out, "profound religious experience grows out of total commitment to a personal God, not allegiance to bare principles and ideals." By getting away from our well-worn cliches and our very familiar theological language, the reality and fuller meaning of such things as faith receive a new freshness as they are treated in this book. Those who submit themselves to the methods of Alcoholics Anonymous do so because they know that it is their only hope. They have abandoned pretense and, as Step Six says, "We were entirely ready to have God remove all these defects of character." When the alcoholic prays, he means business. His prayer makes that of the nominally religious person seem empty and unreal. "We pray that God's will be done in us, but we don't really expect Him to meddle in our more intimate affairs. Instead, what we want is a touch of something like magic, giving us what we need, but letting us go merrily our same old way."

This book is one that deals with reality, and Dr. Taylor in his concluding chapter makes clear his own position when he says, "A.A. needs to realize that the Scriptures, the Sacraments and the Sabbath are not trivial; the Church, on the other hand, could use proof that God accompanies man to his place of business six days a week. A.A. should remember that besides the present there is also eternity; the Church could use an occasional reminder that besides eternity there is also the present." Every pastor will find this book worthy of his attention for two reasons: (1) to acquaint him with a movement

that welcomes the interest and assistance of the Church, and that is at work within his community; and (2) to help him realize anew the potentialities of earnest prayer and a dynamic faith in Jesus Christ.

MALCOLM A. JEEVES

•

Philosophy and the Ideological Conflict: Charles S. Seely; Philosophical Library, New York, 1953. 317 pp. $5.00.

This is an astonishing book! I thought I knew what Jacob Burckhardt meant in his famous Basel lectures when he warned us of the "terrible simplifiers," but to see simplification carried to such a bizarre theoretical extreme leaves this reviewer slightly stunned. It's a bit incredible to see a man take all the historical diversity of the West and pack it into two small handy pill boxes, one called idealism and the other materialism. Then to see the one labeled poison and the other elixir! To hear that science has superseded blundering philosophy, and that religion, as helpful as it might have been in the years of mankind's immaturity, is now quite obsolete! To be told that socialist society, now being achieved in Russia (sic), if not impeded by a third world war, will bring greater benefits to the children born into its realm than will accrue to children under any other system. Yes! This is astonishing. Almost as astonishing as all the assumptions, the rough and all too ready "perhaps" and "possibly" and "of course" which sprinkle the pages with madcap generalizations. This is a tract for modern materialism—read it and understand why Burckhardt felt he was looking into the abyss as he faced the future.

SAMUEL H. MILLER

•

How to Stop Worrying and Start Living: Dale Carnegie; Simon and Schuster, New York, 1948. 30 pp. $2.95.

Some go from doctor to doctor, and others, who cannot afford that, turn from book to book of this sort, hoping that some easy formula will be found to banish all their ills. Although these books may be of some help to a few people, they usually provide only enough buoyancy to keep foundering lives afloat, without emptying the bilge or stopping the leaks sufficiently to enable them to take on cargo and steer a true course.

In *How to Stop Worrying and Start Living* Dale Carnegie (in characteristic and familiar "I'm-human-just-like-you" style) gives rule-of-thumb methods for pulling out of discouragement and failure by one's own bootstraps. He states and repeats much practical "horse-sense" advice, doffs his hat to counseling and psychiatry, lauds religion and prayer as valuable aids, and leaves the impression that worldly success and happiness are as closely related in the dish of life as ham and eggs in a truck driver's breakfast.

Lacking insight into, and constructive help with, the basic personality difficulties underlying worry, and dealing principally with surface factors and solutions, the book is more a soporific than a panacea.

CHARLES M. STYRON

Who Shall Survive: J. L. Moreno; Beacon House, Beacon, New York, 1953. 763 pp. $12.50.

To watch a mind develop or a theory evolve is ever an exciting experience and one which becomes especially stimulating when that mind and that theory are as original as those presented in the new and revised edition of Dr. Moreno's *Who Shall Survive.* Moreover, this volume possesses historical as well as theoretical importance since group dynamics, sociometry, and psychodrama were all fathered by Dr. Moreno. It is, however, too detailed and too highly specialized to be of great immediate or practical service to the parish clergyman.

INA MAY GREER

OUR REVIEWERS

Samuel H. Miller is pastor of the Old Cambridge Baptist Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts . . . *Ernest E. Bruder* is Protestant Chaplain at Saint Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C., and Editor-in-Chief of this JOURNAL . . . *Archibald F. Ward, Jr.,* is Resident Chaplain at Eastern State Hospital in Williamsburg, Virginia . . . *Rollin J. Fairbanks* is Professor of Pastoral Theology at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts . . . *Prentiss L. Pemberton* is Associate Professor of Social Ethics at Andover Newton Theological School in Newton Centre, Massachusetts . . . *Frederic B. Kellogg* is Chaplain to Episcopal Students at Harvard University . . . *George H. Williams* is Acting Dean of Harvard Divinity School . . . *Philip Humason Steinmetz* is pastor of St. John's Church and The Congregational Church in Ashfield, Massachusetts . . . *Raymond W. Albright* is Professor of Church History at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts . . . *Orlo Strunk, Jr.,* is at the School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts . . . *Elita Davenport Wallace* is Devotional Chairman of the Women's Auxiliary of the Diocese of Massachusetts . . . *Paul B. Maves* is Associate Professor of Religious Education at Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey . . . *Elizabeth Bonney Burns* is a clergyman's wife in Auburndale, Massachusetts . . . the late *Willard L. Sperry* was Dean Emeritus of Harvard Divinity School . . . *George W. Barrett* is Professor of Pastoral Theology at General Theological Seminary in New York City . . . *John Dixon Copp* is Assistant Professor of Pastoral Psychology at Boston University School of Theology . . . *Malcolm A. Jeeves* is a psychologist at Harvard University . . . *Charles M. Styron* is pastor of the First Parish Church in Lincoln, Massachusetts . . . *Ina May Greer* is Research Associate in Psychiatry at Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Wanted—copies of Vol. VII, No. 1 (Spring 1953 issue) of this Journal. We shall be glad to pay $1.00 per copy for a limited number of copies of this issue. If you have one that you can spare, please write to Dr. Luberta M. McCabe, Managing Editor, 61 Lexington Avenue, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts. Please do not send the *Journal* until you are asked to do so.

•

President John R. McCurdy of George Williams College announces leave of absence to Dr. Sylvanus M. Duvall. This leave has been granted in order that he may accept an invitation from the World Council of Churches to work with his wife, Dr. Evelyn M. Duvall, in jointly conducting conferences on family relations for church leaders. Their conferences will take the Duvalls to Japan, Manila, India, Palestine, and various countries in Europe, especially England.

•

Case Records for Study and Teachings, a new volume of cases contributed by public and private agencies, has just been published by the Family Service Association of America. The material illustrates short-contact and referral services, intake study, and continued treatment in work with children and adults. The price is $2.85 and the book can be ordered from the Family Service Association of America, 192 Lexington Avenue, New York 16, New York.

•

The National Association for Mental Health has issued a helpful booklet entitled *The Clergy and Mental Health.* A copy may be secured by writing to the Association at 1790 Broadway, New York 19.

•

All persons interested in the pastoral care of the mentally ill should write to the Department of Mental Health (Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 15 Ashburton Place, Boston 8, for a copy of the brochure entitled *You and the Chaplain.* It was prepared by the Public Education Committee, Department of Institutional Ministry of the Massachusetts Council of Churches and although of only four pages it offers an excellent presentation of the chaplain's role.

•

The National Association for Mental Health, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, has issued a 24-page booklet listing mental health publications and audio-visual aids. Groups planning mental health programs may request copies of this list in moderate quantities, without charge, for distribution at meetings, institutes, and conferences.